

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

MAY, 1857.

ART. I.—THE NEW THEOLOGY.

MUCH of the interest in religious discussions which, a half-century ago, was engaged in the Unitarian Controversy, is now enlisted in the developments of what is called "The New Theology." Among communions nominally adhering still to the formulas and doctrines of Orthodoxy are many men of mark and power whom their brethren accuse of heretical tendencies. It is not strange that Unitarians should feel a lively interest in the many developments of the past few years which expose the efforts and struggles of the advanced minds in orthodox communions. They have produced for our perusal and study many laborious volumes and many vigorous essays, laden with the results of profound scholarship, and quickened with the glow of true piety. In no age of the Christian Church has the current theological literature been so attractive in itself, so worthy of extended circulation, so free from the poisonous elements of acrimony and passion, or so edifying in subject-matter and spirit, as in our own time. We confess to finding the materials for our own most profitable hours of thought and study in the fresh theological utterances of some noble-minded and scholarly Christian men who traditionally regard us as

outside of the Christian fold. It might be said that our interest is only of that questionable character which loves to mark the tokens of discord or the signs of division in a hostile camp. We may be charged with heresy-hunting for the sake of finding comfort under our own state of exclusion from Christian fellowship. Of course there is a risk of that sort besetting us. We would endeavor to appreciate the kindness which reminds us of our liability to it, and we would endeavor to reinforce our candor, and to overcome our own prejudices, that we may not injuriously or uncharitably interpret any generous concessions of Orthodoxy as affording comfort to our heresy. We may be too ready to claim every free expression of every free mind as a discomfiture of our opponents and an amicable recognition of our own position. But while we would not assume to be secure against the weakness thus recognized, we are conscious of a higher and purer reason for our interest in the developments of the New Theology. We believe it to be among the possibilities of things, that the Orthodoxy which we have rejected may still be of service to us. We should be ashamed to boast of a contempt for all its scholarship, devotion, and piety. The largest modifications of religious or doctrinal philosophy to which some orthodox men are inclined to yield, still keep them aloof from sympathy with us. We are bound, therefore, to read their freest pages with the conscientious and most earnest purpose of rectifying possible errors and supplying possible defects in our own theological system by the help of men who prove their sincerity alike by what they yield in our favor and by what they retain to our reproach. We trust therefore that our orthodox brethren will interpret our interest in the speculative and doctrinal liberalism of which their communions have recently afforded us so many instructive tokens, as attaching but in part to our pleasure at the discomfiture of Orthodoxy, and for the rest to our desire to be made aware of the possible—we will even say the probable—defects and errors of Unitarianism. With this introduction, we proceed to treat of the New Theology. We do not intend to enter upon any elaborate exposition or any learned discussion of the materials which crowd upon us in overwhelming abundance. We aim only for a more popular and simple treatment of our subject.

A New Theology has been in every age of the Christian Church the hope and the object of one party in its fold, and by another party the same title has been used for designating the whole series of successive heresies while in their incipient state. Till the rupture takes place, both parties claiming a common orthodoxy divide between them the epithets *progressive* and *conservative*. The New Theology always receives its first nurture in the bosom of Orthodoxy. Sometimes its early training is most affectionately fostered by those who visit upon its mature development the most bitter hostility. When what has thus for a proper length of time been under subjection and pupilage manifests itself as palpable and full-grown heresy, Orthodoxy discards all relationship with it. Henceforward it must take a name, and the party adopting it must stand by itself, excommunicated, until time or strength or success gives to it that assurance of its own full Christian integrity and authority which it may find in being able to excommunicate a subordinate party that has risen up in its own fellowship. The Roman Church for an indefinite time sheltered a New Theology, which in due course developed into Protestantism. Reaching its maturity and manifesting its undeniable heretical qualities, Protestantism came under excommunication, and it was not long before it found itself strong enough to set up for Orthodoxy within a limited fold and region of its own. Then in turn Orthodox Protestantism began to hear warnings of a New Theology as announcing the aim and hope of a party called Puritans. Puritanism, having reached man's estate, was offered its choice either to be chastised into obedience and submission, or to be driven out to set up for itself. It chose to set up for itself, though under a double sentence of excommunication from pope and prelate. But still the possibilities of novelty in the field of Christian theology were not exhausted. As sentences of excommunication multiplied, the fear of that penalty lost its power to overawe free souls. As the sentence has been annually kept in vigor at Rome against English and all other Protestantism, and no harm has ever yet been known to come from it, it was hardly likely to inspire terror when pronounced by any communion that was already under its ban. It would be as unreasonable to fear a repetition

of excommunication, as it would be to fear in one's own person the undergoing of successive capital punishments. So Unitarianism, which ages of corruption had only kept in abeyance from a reassertion of the pure, the primitive Gospel, was for a time the New Theology in the Protestant, Reformed, Puritan, Independent Orthodox Church. Unitarianism engaged in its turn the interest and excited the hostility which attend the last development of organized dissent before it has been visited with excommunication. Unitarianism attempted to reduce the Christian faith, not to its *minimum* as is often affirmed, but to its *ultimatum*, by going back to the primitive substance of the Gospel. There can be no further heresy developed from Unitarianism but the heresy of actual unbelief in revelation, — a heresy, by the by, which is just as possible, and which in fact has as often been realized, under all the other forms of Christian theology.

But when Orthodoxy has rid itself by processes of exclusion and excommunication of the successive heresies which have developed in its own communion into parties capable of an independent life, its warfare is by no means ended. Hardly has the expurgated fold kept its feast of purification before its exercises of humiliation begin again. Heretical processes will still go on within the best-guarded fold, and very soon after it has exorcised its avowed traitors. While excommunicated heresies are frankly labelled with their own assumed or imposed titles, they have to part with that of the New Theology, which they bore before their ejection. That title is always reserved as the designation of the undeveloped views of the progressive party, the embryo and incipient heretics, the lovers of novel speculations and free thought, who in due course of time will give evidence of their presence and industry in the orthodox fold. Thus "The New Theology" is now the title of the more or less perfectly developed and avowed, but not as yet excommunicated heresies, that are known to exist in those communions of Christians which have withdrawn fellowship from acknowledged Unitarians and fortified themselves within their citadels of nominal Orthodoxy.

There is a form of religious faith floating around the

communities where Christian thought and sentiment are most active, and giving the most significant tokens of its energetic working in our best theological literature, — to which is for the time being attached the title of "The New Theology." Its opponents in Great Britain have endeavored, with some degree of success, to substitute the title of *The Negative Theology*. We have called it a *form* of faith. But perhaps that is too strong and definite a term to be applied to what has not as yet taken a distinct shape, or set itself forth in clearly stated and systematic views. The popular mind is but very imperfectly acquainted with the facts of the case, as these are known and watched by professional observers. Yet, as we shall attempt to show, this popular mind is one of the chief elements, one of the most important parties, in the interest of the subject. Indeed, it is from time to time a matter of curious speculation with us how the uninitiated readers of the religious journals of our orthodox brethren interpret to themselves the incidental and sketchy references to the developments so constantly brought to their notice. For instances, take the following, selected from a very rich budget of similar cases. The North British Review is established in the championship of Scotch Orthodoxy, and with the design of offering able discussions by the most competent men of subjects which the other quarterlies treat after too free and heretical a manner. That Review wins a large circulation and a high repute, both well deserved because of its sterling merits. In successive numbers we are treated with two noble articles on Missions to the Heathen, and on Dr. Chalmers. Running through both articles, entering into their very stamina and substance, forming indeed the very point and pith of their strength, are unmistakable tokens of opinions held by their writers utterly inconsistent with real orthodoxy. These indications are all the more significant to liberal readers, because they imply and intimate much more than they directly advance, though their assertions and positions are frank and bold to a degree which is startling. We read some of the pages with amazement which subsides into a calm delight over these manifest evidences of progress within denominations which have tried every method to resist it. Here we have a sentence or a paragraph

which flings actual contempt on some one of the most positive articles of the creed ; and then we have a sly hint or suggestion, the *animus* of which is plainly intended to convey its risky suggestion only to a safe esoteric circle of readers. By and by we watch to see how these bold utterances will be received by the orthodox. The Review tells us it is impious to suppose or to proclaim for the sake of swelling missionary funds that the Heathen will perish because they know not the Gospel. The Review also challenges the repute of Dr. Chalmers, confesses his incompetency as a great Christian advocate against unbelievers, and affirms the untenableness of his view—the orthodox view—of inspiration. Some of the religious newspapers commend in general terms the contents of the Review. Others, whose editors are more watchful, spy out these alarming heresies, and in little paragraphs of invidious, alarmed, or deprecatory strain, follow a second-hand, diluted, or unfair report of them with their rebuke. Again, the Orthodox Dissenters of Great Britain establish monthly and weekly religious journals in the interest of their cause, and pledged to defend their orthodoxy. They try to select able men for editors and contributors, because the scholarship and the literary standard of the times demand that condition for even moderate success. But these able men are very apt now-a-days to be free, progressive, and independent men. As a natural consequence, these pledged orthodox journals are soon found trespassing in heretical fields. The cry of alarm is raised by men of second-rate abilities and of inferior standing, who however are better than any other men for sounding an alarm. The councils of the fellowship are distracted, our own journals catch up the echo of the strife, and give a very partial and insufficient account of its occasion. Once more, Andover and New Haven dare the venture of applying a new philosophy to old theology. Professor Hodge of Princeton is on the watch for every such venturesome speculator, and he reckons with them forthwith in his Review. The Old School religious newspapers rehearse such portions of the questions at issue as suit their space, their idea of fairness, or their temper. Meanwhile, we ask again, what think the uninitiated orthodox readers about these shootings forth and presages of the New Theology ? Some-

thing is going on evidently which they do not comprehend. Their leaders and guides are all orthodox still. They "are all, all honorable men." But they do not seem to understand, or if they understand, they do not indorse, each other. The venerable and honored Dr. Dana, in his vigorous old age, looks with a troubled mind towards Andover, the fond hope of unchangeable orthodoxy in his youth. He is burdened in spirit by a sense of responsibility, but still he finds it impossible to indict a heresy which does not instantly prove an *alibi*. Drs. Tregelles and Davidson are employed to re-edit the orthodox work of Mr. Horne on the Scriptures. They are two of the most competent and distinguished Biblical scholars in Great Britain. The work comes from their hands brimful of such views and opinions as have drawn excommunication on Unitarians. An intense excitement is the consequence. The lesser of the two heretics, Dr. Tregelles, writes a very severe letter against the more heretical Dr. Davidson, his colleague editor, and an incidental development proves that all the pupils of an orthodox school of the prophets have been trained in most alarming defections from the faith by such an instructor. To those who try to get to the bottom, or who without such pains discern the bottom, of all these innumerable tokens of the restlessness, disquietude, and treachery within the fold of reputed orthodoxy, the philosophy of them may be very simple. But to the uninitiated they must be mystifying and perplexing, especially as their leaders decline to give them a full, fair, and unprejudiced view of all the issues thus opened. But it may be worth while for these leaders and sentinels of orthodoxy to ask what the consequences will be when some of these secrets can no longer be kept, and the heraldings of dawn are followed by the orb of light itself.

The New Theology is the title assigned in New England to those modifications of Calvinism which were first systematically proposed by Edwards, and which became perceptibly a trifle *newer*, as developed by Bellamy, Hopkins, West, Benton, Emmons, and others. Those names, — which the orthodox in New England cherish with a homage that we of course cannot be expected to offer, except to the character of the men, for their ability, acuteness, and talent seem to us to be almost absurdly

exaggerated,—those names would be very gladly accepted by the friends of the New Theology of our day, as a protection for their heresies. But we must modernize that word *New* if it is to take in more recent developments. We will frankly say, that we are not interested in what was the New Theology of Edwards. We are on the track of something newer. Not the *nova*, but the *novissima*, is what engages us. A pupil who should translate *novissima luna* as the “new moon” would need to be told that the words mean the moon in the *last* quarter.

It will be understood, therefore, that we use the title of this paper as defining the as yet not perfectly developed religious system of those who claim to hold the substance of the old orthodoxy, but who have essentially modified its symbolical exposition, the terms for stating its elements, and the philosophical language in which it casts itself. The able and progressive men of whose speculations we are writing would freely admit that they had gone the lengths in heresy which we have just defined. Perhaps some of them who will still claim to be orthodox would confess to having gone a little farther. We wish, however, to be held as uttering therefore only an inference of our own, not an admission of theirs, when we add the expression of our honest and firm belief, that many of them do go farther, some of them consciously, some of them unconsciously. We are convinced that their concessions and modifications of creed reach beyond the mere philosophy of orthodoxy, and assail its doctrinal substance, its very life. We will add, that if this be only a surmise of our own, then there is a vast deal of agitation about nothing in the debates of our most intelligent divines. The vigorous life, the interest of religious thought and discussion, in our day, are almost wholly identified with the concealed or avowed divergencies of belief among those who nominally accept the same creed. The heretics in the Church cause the heretics outside of it to be forgotten.

It may be asked how we know that there is any such restlessness in the larger ecclesiastical folds, any secret modification of old religious opinions working effectually at the sources of thought, though eluding definition? We answer, because we know that there are recognized par-

ties in each of the great orthodox communions, because their newspapers are blindly discussing some suspected and half-acknowledged heresies within the pale of supposed uniformity, and because the more able men, the leaders of thought, especially some of the teachers in the most flourishing theological seminaries, are well understood to have essential differences with each other. It may not perhaps be spoken of as a matter of common notoriety, but all those who would be likely to know are very well aware that there are doctrinal divisions with which tolerance is compelled to bear, because policy forbids a rupture in reference to them. Heretics have learned to cling to their own native folds. They do not go off as they once did. They are not driven off so summarily as they once were. Ecclesiastical discipline, once so bold and incessant in applying its tests, has become very forbearing; because of this reason among others, that it fears to encounter the work which might possibly lead on from a venturesome beginning. There is infinitely more material for such discipline now than there ever was before. Many members of the English Church, who from time to time utter themselves upon the feuds which now distract it, maintain that the real wisdom and sufficiency of its principles are for the first time put to the trial in the comprehensiveness under which it embraces all the creeds and all the scepticisms that prevail in Christendom. This opinion startles some of the living, but we apprehend that the true test of it would be—if it admitted of the application—to imagine some of the departed victims of the old intolerance of that Church to be summoned from their graves and treated with the gentle announcement of that plea. That certainly is the *newest* doctrine of our times.

The question now presents itself, — What scope or material is there for anything that can be fairly called “A New Theology”? How can the old, worn ways of thought, the wrinkles in the world’s weary brows, be made fresh again, so that they will receive a new impress? How can the formulas of faith be converted to the uses of a new theological creed? Especially, if this question concerns robust and honest minds, and is to be pursued under the limiting condition that the New Theology is *substantially* the Old Theology, — how can we expect a

reward for our pains in trying to track the shape of new impressions on these old ways? We must now sharpen our vision.

Theology is the oldest of human sciences. The epithet *human* belongs as justly to it as it does to any of the sciences; for though the themes of theology are divine, its forms and methods and processes are subjected to precisely the same limitations, through our finite and fallible minds, as are attached to the pursuit of either of the departments of human inquiry. Theology is the human term for expressing the science of divinity. It covers all man's thought, philosophy, and theory about the things of God. We call it the oldest of all the sciences, not only because it enters into the first records of the thought and history of our race, but also because every science which might aspire to an earlier date would be sure to involve the theological views of the minds whose observations on nature, on life, or on man it comprehended.

But what is thus found to be the oldest of sciences has been described by two extreme classes of those interested in it under two most inconsistent epithets. One class has pronounced it to be unprogressive, making no advance upon the elemental substance or materials with which it first started, as the first generation exhausted its discoveries and recognized all its insoluble problems. Another class of students comprehends those who, whether with boasting or complaint, allege that theology is a progressive, unstable science, never permanently settled on its foundation, and continually changing in its substance as well as in its terminology.

Every Christian age has had to recognize something which, rightly or wrongly, has been called "A New Theology." The phrase is suggestive to some of all that is quickening and cheering in the evidence of progress,—progress in the discovery of truth, in every province of human interest. To others the phrase is synonymous with heresy, and what is signified by it is a fright and a bugbear. But can we hesitate to call theology a progressive science? It certainly deserves the epithet progressive if it deserves the title of a science. How can it be otherwise than progressive, seeing that it is cumulative, that it is built up out of theories, that it arrays

men in contending schools of opinion, and makes every independent thinker upon it an independent theorist. Of course we must allow for the fact, which is merely disguised in the familiar trick of language that ascribes to the theme of our thoughts the modifications which actually are made only in our own opinions. When we say that theology is a progressive science, we mean that men make progress in their dealing with subjects essentially unchangeable, in their theories about truths which were perfect and assured before a single human mind engaged upon them. In this sense, theology has proved to be the most progressive of all sciences. More startling revolutions of human opinion are to be traced in connection with man's views of the Divine nature, attributes, and government, than are to be recognized as wrought in his views of the physical universe by all the amazing discoveries and processes in the crowded cyclopaedias of natural philosophy. And in fact the progress of the natural sciences has been the most effective agency in modifying theological opinions, in subverting dogmas and doctrines of a venerable authority, and in compelling each generation of human beings, as it advanced in civilization and knowledge, to find a higher method, a nobler argument, for vindicating the ways of God to men. Theology, as a science, bears down with it from age to age all that made its themes interesting to the first thinkers, and all that was added to it by their speculations upon it. Originally, theology was the science of Divinity. It is that still, and is besides the science of man's speculations and opinions and theories upon its own original materials. The discussion of Bible doctrines is now hopelessly complicated with philosophy. All in vain, as respects the weight of his warning beyond its probable effect on his young disciple, did St. Paul warn Timothy against "striving about words to no profit,"—against "foolish questions which gender strifes." No age after that of Timothy has heeded the warning. Men cannot do without a philosophy of religion, and all attempts to disconnect religion and philosophy have utterly failed, while those who have most strenuously argued for a doctrinal system nominally drawn from the Bible, and as authoritative in defiance of all philosophy, have been compelled to adopt a

philosophy of their own in the conduct of their argument.

Religion brings down with it from all past ages, not only the records which to those who receive them have a more or less decided authority of infallibility and inspiration, but it comes also laden with the precious or questionable burden of tradition. They may be theoretically right who assert that their Christian liberty makes them wholly independent of tradition, as challenging authority with them in matters of faith. But it is one thing to claim that immunity, and wholly another thing to form our own views under an absolute freedom from the influence of tradition. Tradition passes into the forms of language, into words and idioms and phrases, into versions and translations from one tongue into another. There are expressions, yes, sentences even, in our English Bible, which, in their variations from the exact meaning of the original, carry with them more effectively a traditional construction or authority in the teaching of doctrine, than do any of the most positive decrees of the old councils, or any of the most absolute decisions of ecclesiastical tribunals. It is safe to say that the influence of tradition in doctrine and opinion, and in its associations with the Scriptures and their contents, is the larger element in the faith of even the most ultra Protestants.

Religion brings down with it from past ages some old covenants, creeds, and formulas, and when religion is arrayed and set forth with this traditional garb, it becomes theology. These covenants, creeds, and formulas are of earthly fabrication. They become time-worn and rusty, they get rent and moth-eaten; they need patching; they fade, they become thin, they are outgrown; the faith of the last days cannot adapt itself to them. The Christian Church has always had to concern itself with two very distinct matters, the one being religion, the other being the philosophy of religion. About religion Christians have never had a single dispute or variance among themselves, except on one point; and that has been prolific beyond all statement in debate and strife, namely, as to how religion is involved with the philosophy of religion, that is, with theology,—with an intellectual system or theory of doctrines. Theology

means and includes man's speculations and opinions about God, and the things of God, his being, his nature, his will, his revelations, his relations with humanity, his work in Christ. There never has been an hour in the history of the Church when, among those who received the Scriptures as authoritative in their religion, there has not been difference of opinion on all these subjects which constitute theology. When sufficient interest has been felt in these differences of opinion to prompt to an utterance of them, there has been controversy. Then come into use such terms as "the old theology," and "the new theology." "The new theology" has various synonyms, *heresy* being the one most in use and most readily spoken. The title has been borne, as we have seen, by all the successive modifications of opinion which have manifested themselves within the fold called for the time being that of orthodoxy. It is among the very last of the conditions requisite for the use of this title that there should be absolute, or even relative, novelty in the views to which it is attached. On the contrary, the most startling and striking developments made under a fresh modification of theological opinions have generally been but a revival or reassertion of some very old, and often of primitive opinions. When the wrong-headed conservatives of established error at the time of the Reformation wished for a sharp epithet of reproach to visit upon the rising zeal for the study of the Greek literature, they called it "the new learning"; forgetting that their Latin and Teutonic tongues had to translate from Hellenic sources not only the text of their Scriptures, but also the terms and processes of their philosophy. The newest opinions of the wisest Christian theologians often prove to be a more pretentious exposition of the simple views advanced by those who were first trained in the school of Christ. The great interest with which liberal Christian scholars and theologians watch the ever-restless speculations of all the more vigorous minds in the orthodox communions is to be accounted solely to an expectation that primitive and simple truth will thus be reasserted. We do not look for the striking out of a single ray of new truth in theology. Our highest hope is that the murky darkness with which orthodox philosophy has obscured the light of simple

Gospel verities may be scattered by the agitations raised in the world of opinion. Time was when Unitarianism was called "the new theology." Orthodoxy, having cast that heresy out of its communion, uses some other title to designate our views, and reserves the phrase for application to such of its own heresies as have not yet been visited with the extreme penalty of excommunication.

We have intimated that what is called "the popular mind" is especially concerned in the development of the new theology. It may be taken as an axiom in the history of religious opinions, that all which tends to complicate and pervert theology by abstruse and unscriptural philosophy has come from the brains of professed theologians, while all the influences which tend to the restoration of the primitive simplicity of our faith find their full sympathy in the minds and hearts of those whose best wisdom is common sense. When Protestantism first won possession of a free Bible, it received with it a philosophy of religion which prejudiced an intelligent study and interpretation of it. That philosophy of religion has ever since complicated the faith of men, and when the reception of it has been identified with a belief in the revelation whose substantial truths it is intended to epitomize, it has exposed a religious belief to all the risks consequent upon the action of the mind. When religion is dispensed by its teachers to their pupils in connection with a philosophical theology, the intellectual element will always be more excited than the spiritual. So long as the mass of people of ordinary culture and intelligence can be interested in the metaphysics of divinity, they may be content to refer the perplexities of an orthodox creed to the difficulties they might reasonably expect to find in the intricate processes of philosophy. But the moment they insist upon having a religious creed which shall stand clear of the more involved problems of metaphysics, then they demand that what they are asked to believe shall be reconciled with reason and common sense. It is not so easy for them to indicate the defects and the unscientific qualities in poor metaphysics, as it is for them to appreciate unreasonable, inconsistent, or incredible elements in a simple religious creed. Now we understand the facts of the case to be precisely these. Intelligent cul-

ture and activity of thought in practical directions have induced the result that the mass of people who crave a religious faith and hope demand a better philosophy of religion; or, as the matter more correctly stands in their view, that religion should be distinguished and separated from metaphysics. Let a devout-hearted but clear-minded and inquisitive man, longing for the elements of a religious life to come to him from God in as simple and available a form as light, air, and water, meet with the following sentence, for instance, from the pen of the Old School Dr. Hodge: "A man may be justly accountable for acts which are determined by his character, whether that character or inward state be inherited, acquired, or induced by the grace of God."* If that sentence does not prove a poser even to the clearest brains, our own brains are not trustworthy for judgment. How long divines can expect to carry the faith of common men with them when they write such things as that, is one of the questions for our new theology to dispose of. But no man would dare to write such a sentence were it not for his confidence in the unbounded facilities furnished him by metaphysics, by his philosophy of religion, for evading the common-sense inference from it,—which is, that God, guided by what men recognize as *justice*, may entail a wicked character like a physical disease upon a child of his, and then punish him for its irresistible outgrowth into wicked actions. Such a sentence is admirably adapted to remind us of the large indebtedness of orthodoxy to metaphysics for its boldness in advancing the most outrageous doctrines smothered up in technical language. A leading new theology divine lays down these three distinctive principles: "that sin consists in choice; that our natural power is equal to our duty; and that our duty is limited by our natural power." Here is common sense. To Dr. Hodge, however, it is deadly heresy. Yet he would not venture to assert the opposite of either of these statements in plain, positive language, which admitted of no metaphysical mystification. The demand of "the popular mind" is now that religion be divorced from metaphysical subtleties. Scholars of course interpret

* Princeton Review, January, 1857, p. 135.

this demand as requiring a better system of metaphysics, a new philosophy of the doctrines of revelation. While we may look with but a partially satisfied curiosity to discover the precise shape and amount and degree of the modifications which leading minds in orthodox communions have introduced for softening the sharp features of their system, we have another means of information, very instructive if we use it wisely. We may consult the popular tendencies, the actual state of minds among independent thinkers in the community at large. The new theology has a strong hold upon the convictions and sympathies of large numbers around us. Undefined it may be in these minds, as in the minds or the essays of prominent teachers, but still it is sufficiently apprehended to be available as a creed of living faith and cheering hope, and as a ransom from a night-mare oppression which else would weigh upon the spirit. Our own convictions extend to the length of a firm belief that, within the shattered and no longer defensible intrenchments of disabled orthodoxy, there is under training a party which sooner or later will affiliate with another party, now outside of the fold, to prove the main reliance of the Church when shams and conformities and traditions must sink into ruin.

The new theology then starts with the honest and generous purpose of reconstructing the philosophical method for the statement and explication of the doctrines of revelation. It assumes that the doctrines long recognized as orthodox are substantially true and Scriptural. It flatters itself with the thought that orthodoxy is prejudiced to many serious and intelligent minds, not because of anything really inconsistent or unreasonable in its doctrines, when rigidly tested by the laws of Divine truth or the human understanding, but solely because of its metaphysical exposition. It cherishes the hope that, by recasting or reconstructing the philosophy of the old creed, its sway may be retained and largely extended even to the winning of the allegiance of its open assailants. Whether the new theology can thus spend all its energies upon the philosophy of the creed, and yet spare the creed, is the question of chief interest to us. If our friends who are engaged in this generous enterprise can feel perfectly at ease on that point, and

can find an equivalent interest in watching the experiment for reconciling us to the creed through a new philosophy of it, we see no reason why we cannot amicably afford to sustain our present relations, and to divide our hope for the future. The new school divines think that, by recasting the philosophy of orthodoxy and reconstructing its formulas for the statement of the substance of its old truth, they can meet all that is reasonable or plausible in our objections to orthodoxy as a fair exponent of Christian doctrine. We think that these divines cannot consistently pursue the processes involved in their undertaking, much less bring it to a conclusion which will satisfy us, or even themselves, without introducing essential modifications into the substance of the orthodox creed. Now this issue is worthy of our age, and of the scholarship, the sincerity, the piety which is to try it. Let it be honorably and faithfully contested. Let him be considered as putting himself outside of the lists of this fair Christian contest who introduces into the conduct of it a mean motive, or a word of bitter invective. For our part, we are willing to admit that Unitarianism, as it has been set forth by its ablest expositors, has not approved itself to all who have been competent to test it as an adequate doctrinal summary of Christian truth; nor as an exhaustive transcript of the essence of the religion of the Bible; nor as a fair exponent of the phraseology of Scripture; nor even as a system which can draw and engage the religious sympathies of large numbers of persons of various culture and temperament in the great offices of Christian piety. As we said in the first of this series of papers, so we say in this, which is the last, something has proved to be lacking in Unitarianism. It is true that we can give plausible explanations of its supposed deficiencies, or lack of adaptation to a great variety of intellectual constitutions or spiritual temperaments. We may say that the severe simplicity of its doctrinal system is above the comprehension and offensive to the tastes of many; or that the prejudiced hearing which it addresses, or its inability to cope with rival systems more attractive to the mass of persons and more in harmony with the traditions of piety, stands in the way of its fair and deserved acceptance. But the facts of the case, however

explained, are facts still. While the defects and shortcomings and failures of orthodoxy, and the amount of positive evil which is directly chargeable upon it, are matters which we have had occasion most painfully to know and deplore, we make no boast for ourselves or for our own system. Well, therefore, may we watch with a generous interest the issue whether the nobler spirits of a nominal orthodoxy can make such modifications in it as will satisfy them and reclaim us. Nor will we be churlish about words. We will allow that good word *substance* its largest possible meaning, when a man who we think believes essentially as we do affirms that he holds the substance of orthodoxy. But still there are certain rights vested in dictionaries, and *substance* must always be supposed to mean some part of the thing to which it is applied, and the substantial part of it too. We may say to our orthodox brethren, in the spirit of Christian candor, that never does a humble distrust of our own possible error in the interpretation of the Gospel of Christ present itself with such a religious earnestness to our minds, as when we read the writings of progressive men in their ranks. Their manly sincerity, their intellectual strength, their independence of soul, their fidelity to conscience in their protests against *some part* of orthodoxy, give a new warrant to the portion of it which they retain. But we can conceive of nothing more utterly ineffective, hopeless, or dismal, than the pleadings of the old school divines of our day in defence of their antiquated system.

It will be understood, therefore, from our remarks thus far, that what we are writing of under the title of the New Theology is not a well-defined, consistent system of qualified or modified orthodoxy, which can be gathered out of the published opinions of one or more eminent men. We shall doubtless have something of that sort before long, and we hope that we may be living to welcome it. No one orthodox writer has as yet ventured to give form and shape to a set of formulas whose language varies from those long received so far as to express the new philosophy of religion. So we have to use the title of this article to designate an undeveloped, unsystematized class of speculations, fragmentary portions of which are to be found in a great many publica-

tions, intimations of which are continually presenting themselves in unsuspected quarters, and suspicions of which are known to be far more widely entertained, and on better evidence, than some who are concerned in them care to have made public. This, at least, we are warranted in saying, that, if some of our more acute and earnest theologians are not profoundly exercised by a sceptical spirit in reference to their own orthodoxy, they are trifling with the community, and, what is more, with truth. Clerical scepticism is the root of much of our present religious agitation. Men in the maturity of their intellectual powers, and with the best aids of good scholarship, set to defend and to preach the Gospel, find themselves struggling painfully within the fetters of the creed by which they have pledged themselves. To accept it in its own plain sense, is to them an utter impossibility. They cannot, they do not, believe it in its traditional sense, or in its popular acceptation. They know that the belief which it once expressed, the belief which fashioned the stiff and positive terms of the creed simply for the sake of expressing itself, has not the hold upon the living convictions of Christendom which it once had. The suggestion comes to their minds, that perhaps the substance of the old doctrines may be distinguished from the hard and discredited formulas used for stating them. What Dr. Bushnell calls "the deepest chemistry of thought," is brought to bear upon the perplexity. The creed is subjected to a powerful solvent in the mind. That process it cannot bear without suffering decomposition. The part of it which is digested and made to pass into the spiritual system is then pronounced "the substance of the old doctrine." It ought rather, and more honestly, to be called the substance of what was *true* in the doctrine, for when fair and candid men have thoroughly tried this experiment, they are apt rather to need and seek for the substance of truth in a doctrine, than for the substance of the doctrine itself. Clerical scepticism is a disease under which thousands have suffered who have not proclaimed it, nor, perhaps, manifested the symptoms. But when any professed orthodox scholar undertakes to soften the terms of his creed, or to avail himself of the ambiguities of language for evading its unreasonable or unscriptural dogmas, the

symptoms of his inner state are not to be mistaken. Now we say, without any fear of being challenged for the assertion, that the best works in Biblical criticism and exposition, the most vigorous essays on religious themes, the articles of highest character in the religious quarterlies at home and abroad, the most able sermons, and all the other utterances of the most scholarly, earnest, devout, and effective men in the various orthodox communions, indicate opinions and a spirit more or less inconsistent with the formulas of their creed. Take this select religious literature and compare its contents, page by page, with the writings of the old standard orthodox divines, and the contrast will amaze any reader. We will not transgress the rule of charity, and therefore we will explain our charge of the infidelity of orthodox men to orthodoxy as meaning this,—that, if we avowed ourselves to be believers in the substance of the doctrines of the Westminster Assembly's Catechism or of the Thirty-nine Articles, we could not, in consistency with religious or intellectual honesty, write or preach what we find in the contents of a hundred valuable volumes now lying within our reach, bearing the names of divines in the American Congregational and the English Episcopal churches.

If any one should ask us in what single volume he may find the most of general or particular information upon this latent and undeveloped heresy of "New Theology," we should have to refer him to a volume written by its ablest and most resolute and unflinching opponent. Dr. Hodge of Princeton is now the most distinguished defender of the old school divinity. Manfully and consistently, with his whole heart's zeal, with an honesty which we must respect, and a power which those against whom he exerts it have to fear, does he take up the gauntlet thrown down by every nominally orthodox man who ventures to try his liberal philosophy on the Calvinistic creed. We think that in every such case, starting, of course, on orthodox premises, he has won a fair and honorable triumph over his opponents. He has recently published a stout volume, in which he collects his Essays and Reviews. There is in them strength, courage, acuteness, exact metaphysical skill, and sound doctrinal teaching,—sound, we mean, ac-

cording to the creed, not according to the Scriptures. All the New School men who have ventured to publish their heresies pass under his reckoning in separate papers. Dr. Cox's heresy on Regeneration, Professor Stuart's on Imputation, Dr. Beman's on the Atonement, Professor Finney's on several doctrines, Dr. Bushnell's on Christian Nurture, the Trinity, and the Double Nature of Christ, and Professor Park's on Rhetorical and Logical Theology, are all lucidly discussed, and the views of their respective authors are fairly proved to be inconsistent with the formulas of orthodoxy. Now if any one tells us that the Princeton Professor is fighting only shadows, or has spent so much strength upon the mere verbal technicalities which do not concern the substance of the doctrine, he will cast but a poor reflection upon the best efforts of the ablest men among us. We stand by the Professor, for he stands by us, and he verifies what our own common sense teaches us, that the rebellion of free though devout minds against the creed of orthodoxy has carried them far beyond the lawful limits of metaphysical speculation or philosophical explanation, and has made them treacherous to the creed with whose fair, honest, well-understood teachings orthodoxy stands or falls. We cannot believe that this strife between the masters of Christian science is mere child's play. It is a manly conflict, and some new views enter into the challenge.

And the real aim of the champions of this New Theology is a noble and a generous one. They have all our sympathy, while we yield to their opponent only our conviction that he is more consistent than they. Their object is to redeem Christian truth from metaphysical perplexity; to shape the dogmas of the creed into assertions of faith which will bear to be uttered in this modern age of time; to affirm as doctrines only such positive statements of great, solemn verities as will bear to be looked at in the light of common sense, and professed without the blush of insincerity, and offered to earnest, longing minds without calling out a protest from the heart. These men know that all manner of palliations, evasions, and apologies have to be offered in connection with anything like a hopeful effort to propound the orthodox creed to the clear-headed, the mature, and

the strong-minded of our times. They have been let into the secrets of official or professional intercourse, by which they have learned that orthodoxy requires of its disciples a denial of the rights of reason, and a tribute of implicit faith inconsistent with the fundamental principles of Protestantism. They will not condescend to practise the hoodwinking and the falsifying essential to the maintenance of such doctrinal opinions as have been discredited by more just views of Scripture, of the nature of man, and the government of God. Their hearts are in open rebellion against Calvinism, while their associations through tradition, fellowship, and sentiment are with orthodoxy. They dread Unitarianism. The bad name which their predecessors gave to our heresy has warned them effectually from much sympathy with us. They have a horror of the calm, cold, languid spirit of Unitarianism, of its bleak and houseless exposure, and of the precipices of infidelity which it leaves unfenced. Still they are not orthodox. It is wrong for them to retain the epithet. The severest condemnation of their inconsistency comes in part from their own forced silence, and in part from the positive sentence passed upon them whenever they dare to utter themselves by those who are really orthodox. They wish to make religious doctrines more intelligible, more reasonable, less bewildering, less shocking, as the announcement of solemn truths embracing things human and divine. "No!" say the men of the Old School, "that is the very thing you must not do, for it is the very thing that spoils religion. The bewildering, the mystifying, the confounding element in it is a large part of its life. Let it alone. The more it baffles your reason, and prostrates your pride of mind, the more devout and evangelical will be its influence over you."

Dr. Hodge fairly states the issue opened by the New School men in their attempt to distinguish between the form and the substance of the truth taught in the creed. He maintains, consistently, that the form answers to the substance, and was chosen as the vehicle to convey the substance by those who really believed the substance. "The main point," he says, "is nothing more or less than this: Is that system of doctrine embodied in the creeds of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, in its

substantial and distinctive features, true as to its form as well as to its substance? Are the propositions therein contained true as doctrines, or are they merely intense expressions, true not in the mode in which they are there presented, but only in a vague, loose sense, which the intellect would express in a very different form? Are these creeds to be understood as they mean, and do they mean what they say, or is allowance to be made for their freedom, abatement of their force, and their terms to be considered antiquated and their spirit only as still in force? For example, when these creeds speak of the imputation of Adam's sin, is that to be considered as only an intense form of expressing the 'definite idea, that we are exposed to evil in consequence of his sin'? This is surely a question of great importance."* "The definite idea" which Dr. Hodge puts in contrast with the creed, is that which he ascribes to the teaching of Professor Park.

Again, Dr. Hodge boldly faces his own orthodoxy in the following sentences. "The origin of sin, the fall of man, the relation of Adam to his posterity, the transmission of his corrupt nature to all descended from him by ordinary generation, the consistency of man's freedom with God's sovereignty, the process of regeneration, the relation of the believer to Christ, and other doctrines of the like kind, do not admit of 'philosophical explanation.' They cannot be dissected and mapped off so as that the points of contact and mode of union with all other known truths can be clearly understood; nor can God's dealings with our race be all explained on the common-sense principles of moral government. The system which Paul taught was not a system of common sense, but of profound and awful mystery."† There is a plausibility in the ingenious shaping of the assertions in these sentences. It will be observed that the aim of the new school men is misstated by being exaggerated, if not caricatured, and that the plea of censure against them seeks to strengthen itself by an unfair construction of St. Paul. We do not understand any of those who are interested in the New Theology as asking that the doctrines of revelation shall be so divested of their peculiar

* Essays and Reviews, pp. 572, 573.

† Ibid., p. 583.

characteristics, "dissected," "mapped off," and reduced to the same category as other known truths. Nor do we understand St. Paul as setting "the mystery" of the Gospel in antagonism with common sense. We should hardly have expected of a Christian scholar, holding the position of Dr. Hodge, that he would indorse the popular error in the interpretation of that word *mystery* as applied to the Gospel scheme. He uses it as synonymous with something that baffles reason and confounds common sense, whereas his Master repeatedly asserted that it had been given to those to whom he spoke to know and understand it. The mystery, or rather the *secret*, was disclosed, and the commonest sense was invited to see the simple wisdom, the divine love and mercy, displayed in it. The admission made by Dr. Hodge in the above-quoted sentences will not hinder any one from questioning the metaphysics of orthodoxy in the hope of reconciling common sense and the creed. To proclaim an antagonism between them would be fatal to the world's confidence in the one or the other of them. As it could hardly be expected that the mass of men would give over their reliance upon common sense, they would find a warrant in the assertion of the theologian for distrusting such a "mystery" as was irreconcilable with it. This, however, is to be regarded as one of the results already brought about by the disciples of the New Theology, namely, the drawing forth a confession that the Old Theology and *good* metaphysics cannot be reconciled. A most striking and startling illustration of the same fact transpired in London some four years ago. Mr. Holyoake, the unwearied and by no means despicable champion of that theoretical and practical atheism called "Secularism," which is thought to be alarmingly rife in England, challenged a defender of revelation to a series of formal discussions. The Rev. Mr. Grant accepted the challenge, and a course of public disputations followed. But the Christian advocate, though an orthodox man, expressly demanded that the subjects in debate should not include the peculiar tenets of orthodoxy. The discussions concerned those points of the Christian belief common to us and the orthodox. These were argued precisely as a Unitarian would argue with an unbeliever, and every tenet peculiar to Trinitarianism and

Calvinism was kept out of sight and notice. Mr. Grant did not fear to apply the tests of common sense, sound philosophy, and good metaphysics to the great, fundamental truths and doctrines of the Christian religion, as we regard them. Why, then, should he shrink from their application to what Orthodoxy regards as the life and substance of the Christian system? Again, Mr. Rogers, also in profession an orthodox believer, in his *Eclipse of Faith*, designed to answer the sceptical and rationalistic views of Mr. Newman and others, has not one single word of pleading to offer in the name of reason and philosophy for any of the special tenets of Orthodoxy. He does use those noble weapons, but only as we would use them, and only in behalf of simple Christian verities. Are we mistaken in our inferences from these striking facts?

It would be but an easy task for us to offer in detail a long specification of the doctrinal difficulties in the orthodox formulas, from which relief is sought in the New Theology. We must confine ourselves to a selection, with but few words of comment. First of all comes up the orthodox doctrine of the Inspiration of the Scriptures. Dr. Hodge says, "The old doctrine of the plenary inspiration, and consequent infallibility, of the written word, is still held by the great body of believers."* Now we will not answer for the great body of believers, but we will affirm that the *old* doctrine,—the doctrine of the creed,—the doctrine proposed, argued for, and accepted even a hundred years ago on that subject,—is not the doctrine of leading orthodox divines at the present day. Nothing but subtle tricks of language as to the meaning of words, nothing but evasions and special pleadings when insurmountable difficulties are encountered, will serve to vindicate an antiquated and exploded superstition on this subject. A Christian scholar knows very well what was understood when the creed defined the doctrine of inspiration by the words *plenary* and *infallibility*. Any competent theologian who tries now to assert the old, stringent claim conveyed by those words, must trifle with truth. The issue raised on this subject is very plain, even to the unlearned; it may all be expressed and set forth in a few words. Each of the Evangelists gives

* *Essays and Reviews*, p. 539.

us a copy of the inscription over the cross of the Saviour. Matthew says it was "This is Jesus, the King of the Jews"; Mark, that it was "The King of the Jews"; Luke, that it was "This is the King of the Jews"; and John, that it was "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews." Now, what was the inscription? Suppose the design were to erect in the most splendid Christian temple a more imposing artistic representation of the crucifixion than was ever yet wrought, and that it was proposed to set the inscription on the cross in blazing diamonds. Which of these four versions—given in a plenarily inspired and *infallible* record—shall the artist follow? The very claim set up for the record suggests the perplexity. No one would be embarrassed by it, except when it is aggravated by an assertion which is utterly irreconcilable with it. The inscription could not have been written in all the four ways in which it stands in the Four Gospels. Three of them at least, then, are not *infallible*, unless a trick is played with the meaning of that word. Nor shall we find help in the suggestion that the variations may arise from different ways of putting into English the original words given by the Evangelists. The Greek text presents these variations. Let the same process be tried with the four narratives of the Saviour's resurrection, or with the three accounts given in the Book of Acts of the conversion of St. Paul. Let the structure and contents of the whole Bible be studied in the light of our best wisdom, and let the phenomena which they present be confronted with the fair and honest signification of the terms *infallibility* and *plenary inspiration*. The result must be, either that the meaning of those words must be tampered with, or that they must no longer be used to define a dogma about the Bible as a whole. Honest, candid, and inquisitive Christian scholars and readers of all denominations are confronting this fact. Dr. Hodge may tell us that "the great body of believers" still hold to this or that. The assertion is of very little consequence, whether it be admitted or denied. We have serious facts to deal with. We are asking what the great body of believers of the next generation will have to hold by in this matter. We are asking how those who, as orthodox men, profess to hold the old doctrine of the creed on this point, are to rec-

oncile it, not merely with their speculations, but with the contents of the Bible? It is but poor and miserable dogmatism, heartless and cruel contempt, which would invoke the *odium theologicum* to the aid of a discomfited and discredited superstition against men who are laboring in the utmost sincerity of soul to find a more truthful expression for their faith. The strictures to which we have referred in that remarkable article in the North British Review are a fair exhibition of the incompetency of Dr. Chalmers's views on the subject to meet the facts and phenomena that are to be taken into account. The New Theology has subverted the old theory of the *inspired infallibility* of all the contents of Scripture. We do not believe that it will rest content with quibbling with the two words, but will labor to define and vindicate a new and defensible statement of such a truth as to the authority and value of the Bible as will make it not one whit less precious to us all. For the simple fact is, that the doctrinal formula and the popular belief on this point are cast in a form which does not fit the manifest evidence of the very contents of the Bible. The abatement already allowed in the old doctrine, and hardly contested by any one whose arguments have weight, amounts to this: it distinguishes between the inspiration of the *sentiments* contained in the Bible, and the inspiration of the *writers* who were prompted by God to put those sentiments on record. Thus our New Theology men affirm that there are objectionable and positively false sentiments and statements advanced in the Bible; as, for instance, in the Books of Job and Ecclesiastes; and these cannot in any sense be said to be inspired of God. But still they were none the less *written* by inspiration of God, as God induced and qualified the scribes to put them down as entering into the method of a divine oversight over human errors and follies. There have been some very able statements of this distinction by orthodox men. It is easy to apply it in some cases, but when we come to test it in reference to alleged errors and discrepancies in the writings of inspired men about things within their own knowledge, the distinction is found to labor.

We see that high praise is lavished in some quarters upon the new work on this profoundly serious sub-

ject by Mr. Lee.* We think the book will most grievously disappoint those who turn to it for wise instruction and efficient relief. The author seems to understand and appreciate the difficulty and the urgency of his work, for he says: "With reference to the *nature* of inspiration itself, and to the possibility of reconciling the unquestionable stamp of humanity impressed upon every page of the Bible with that undoubting belief in its perfection and infallibility which is the Christian's most precious inheritance, it may safely be maintained that in English theology almost nothing has been done; and that no effort has hitherto been made to grapple directly with the difficulties of the subject."† He intimates his own especial method of argument in the following sentence: "There is one principle which forms a chief element of the theory proposed in the following Discourses,—I mean the distinction between Revelation and Inspiration,—that has never, to my knowledge, been consistently applied to the contents of Holy Scripture, even by those writers who insist upon its importance."‡ When approaching the close of his work, the author says: "Thus far I have endeavored to lay down principles from which the divine authority, the infaillible certainty, and the entire truthfulness, of every part of the Scriptures must necessarily result. To this conclusion many exceptions have been taken; and with some general observations on the nature and foundation of such exceptions, these Discourses shall fitly terminate."§ Our readers would care but little to know how an author who could affirm the above inferences from his principles, would meet the facts and explain the phenomena that are utterly inconsistent with them. His work is weakest where it ought to be strongest. He evades what he leads us to suppose he is about to reconcile and explain. He tries to withstand the allowance indorsed by Mr. Alford, another University man, that the Apostles, in quoting the Greek version of the Old Testament from memory, have fallen into mistakes, and affirms that, if this were capable of proof, it

* *The Inspiration of Holy Scripture, its Nature and Proof.* By William Lee, M A., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College. New York: Carter and Brothers. 1857.

† Preface.

‡ Ibid.

§ Page 342.

would be "obviously fatal to that view of the inspiration of Scripture which I have endeavored to maintain, according to which each and every portion of the Bible is perfect and divine." * He seems to censure Professor Stuart for "having enumerated, *without annexing any refutation*, most of the strong points which De Wette and others conceive that they have established against the Books of Chronicles." † We have no doubt it would have greatly rejoiced the excellent Professor to have *annexed such refutations*, if he had only known where to find them. So much for the matter of Inspiration. The issue raised there is no longer one between the Unitarians and the Orthodox. The New Theology is at work upon it.

The aim of the New Theology in its dealings with the organic doctrines of Orthodoxy is one which we are to infer from a great many intimations of it from a great many different sources. Religion, as it is presented to our minds through the education by which we have received our knowledge of it, comes to us as a homogeneous whole, combining divine and human elements. Our first efforts in theology suggest to us the necessity of distinguishing between these human and divine elements as regards the sources of our knowledge and the substance and authority of the truths supposed to be received through each of them. And then comes up the question, How far off, how deep down, must we begin in attempting to draw this distinction? How radical must the process be? The old school men are right in affirming that theological soil does not admit of mere top-dressing to any good purpose, and that its crops cannot be changed by sprinkling seed on the surface. The wisest and most candid inquirer, the least prejudiced and most unbiased student in theology, can never succeed in relieving himself wholly of the constraining influence on his own mind of the system under which he has been trained, and from which he starts when he begins his investigations. He has fixed for himself the meanings of important words. He has formed his associations of sympathy, his prejudices of sentiment, and in large measure his standard of judgment. His present views or prepossessions, his inclinations, and his range of speculation, have been deter-

* Page 304.

† Page 393, note.

mined by circumstances. He naturally takes his traditional or habitual method for deciding between truth and error as the standard by which his further inquiries are to be regulated. He asks himself whether he is to believe more or less than *what he now believes*. The mould already formed in his own mind gives shape to the new materials which he receives into it. Every workman must find some of the conditions of his work in his materials, and whatever novelties of pattern he may propose will be judged to be improvements or defects according as they are compared with some present pattern. Every theological inquirer starts with a creed, which, up to the date of his first attempt to subject it to a thorough inquisition, has passed with him for a standard and symbol of truth. He soon finds a fruitful, almost an exhaustless and endless task, in settling the meaning of theological terms, in coming to an understanding with others about their use of those terms, in asking whether all who employ them connect the same sense with them. The range within which we may accord in our opinions with others, and yet contend and quarrel hopelessly in our attempts to express our views in common formulas, is a problem which requires vast wisdom and unbounded charity for its solution. Nor are the perplexities which arise from this source relieved by our agreeing to use Scripture terms in our theological discussions. All the terms used in these discussions become technical. They are generally chosen from other languages than our own, and are perplexed with etymological niceties of definition, or they are used in a sense different from that which associates them with common, earthly things. These technical theological terms are adopted as if more expressive or comprehensive in their signification than any which our household speech affords; but certainly one prevailing reason with theologians for keeping them in use is, that they are often so vague and indefinite, and so burdened with double meanings, like old oracles, as to allow those who employ them a considerable range of liberty, and to excuse them from being too explicit. If we take any one of the contested problems in doctrinal or speculative theology, we find it to be involved with terms each of which asks for a re-definition, or a rectification of its

popular or scholarly interpretation, before any new writer can profitably use it in discussion. He must at any rate tell us in what sense, and with what limitations, he intends to use each of these test words. Thus, in discussing the question of the freedom of the will, the venturesome speculator must define anew, or choose out of many accepted definitions that in which he intends to use, such words as these, *Ability*, *Motive*, *Freedom*, *Necessity*, *Contingency*, *Will*, &c. He can make no progress till he has done this, and in doing it he has unbounded opportunities for bewitching the simple truth, for confusing himself and mystifying his readers. He may find, after all, that he has but been traversing the same old weary cycle of human thought symbolized to us in the motion of the serpent as it curls on till its two extremities, its beginning and its end, meet tog'ther and complete the circle. Our dictionaries grow larger with every revision of them, and while our language is adopting new words, it is also doubling the significations of some of its very oldest words. Professor Whewell opens this whole issue, when he distinguishes between the language of science and the language of Scripture in reference to the needful changes to be recognized by the progress of thought. He says: "Science is constantly teaching us to describe known facts in new language; but the language of Scripture is always the same."* But we have to change our scientific language because we get a better knowledge of scientific facts. As we cannot change the language of Scripture, we have to allow for changes that creep into the meaning of words, and for the associations that may erroneously attach to them; and so, while studying the truths of Scripture, we have to show the variance of our philosophy of them by casting them into new formulas. Then, too, our theology, or our philosophy of religion, must respect the facts and the form of revelation in spite of its perplexities and its seeming anomalies; precisely as our natural philosophy has to respect the mysterious and inexplicable phenomena of nature. Taking all these things into view, we may well understand how complicated is the task of the theologian in attempting to

* History of Inductive Sciences, Vol. I. p. 686.

fathom and systematize the profound themes of his study. His attempt resembles, in one respect at least, that of the experimenter who is seeking to sound the ocean depths, and finds that the necessary weight of the plummet and the length of his line become embarrassing to him, and may leave him in doubt whether he has reached bottom.

We find, then, that the aim of the New Theology admits to itself an earnest and determined spirit in the pursuit of such speculative ends as the following,—even at the risk of doing something more than speculate, if it be found necessary to do more. It seeks to reconstruct the formulas for the statement of fundamental doctrines, and to rectify their phraseology. It seeks to secure a more philosophical expression of the truths which these formulas are intended to convey, without any essential variation from the accepted doctrines which are admitted to be announced by them. Again, the New Theology wishes to modify in some cases the philosophy of doctrine, by softening some aspects of some of its dogmas which have been exaggerated in their exhibition, and by reconciling some of its inconsistencies, with a view to a more harmonious system. If all this can be done and leave the solemn old sanctities of the creed to an unimpaired reverence and an undiminished faith, the new form shall be offered as but a better way for setting forth the old substance. But if these speculative processes are found to involve substantial changes of doctrine, what then? Dr. Hodge says, and he writes like a most earnest and perfectly competent witness, that the New Theology cannot even argue for, much less reach, its intended alterations in the philosophy of doctrine, without trifling with and perilling its substance. The doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Atonement ask of the New Theology at least a reconstruction of the formulas for expressing their orthodox teaching. The objection to the use of the word *Persons* in stating the doctrine of the Trinity has been well-nigh universally admitted by our best theologians, for the double reason that the formula does not convey the real idea which they wish to express, and that it does assert something which they do not wish to affirm. Dr. Bushnell has gone beyond any writer, still holding to the repute of

Orthodoxy, in challenging not only the language of the formulas, but the contents of them, in reference to the three doctrines just specified. Dr. Hodge says: "He rejects the old doctrine of the Trinity and Incarnation; but he has produced no other intelligible doctrine. He has not thought himself through. He is only half out of the shell. And therefore his attempt to soar is premature."* The difficulty which most Unitarians have found with Dr. Bushnell is,—if we may use the not very elegant similes of the Princeton Professor,—that he is carrying about with him some fragments of his broken shell, and even with that encumbrance soars too high for them. "He rejects the doctrine of three persons in one God," says Dr. Hodge, and "in opposition to such a Trinity he presents and urges the doctrine of an historical Trinity, a threefold revelation of God,—a trinity of revelations." Still, Dr. Bushnell is evidently striving after and intending to hold *the truth*, the Scripture truth, which the makers of the creed endeavored to convey in the formula. We may put in the same claim. Let us understand what Scripture *truth* is conveyed in it, and we too will accept it.

Dr. Hodge says much the same of the "half-ism" of Orthodoxy to which Dr. Bushnell clings in his view of the Incarnation,—as God appearing under the limitations of humanity, without admitting a distinct human soul in Christ, or assigning to him a twofold nature. More positive still is the Princeton Professor in condemning Dr. Bushnell's "Altar view" of the Atonement, "which regards it as designed to produce a subjective effect, to impress men with a sense of God's love,"† &c.

But the New Theology does not confine its venturesome speculations to these three doctrines. It grapples not only with the orthodox formulas of the nature, corruption, and destiny of man, but it assails with something more than metaphysical strength,—yes, even with the logic of common sense,—the doctrines which are adequately expressed in those formulas. Here the aim is to find, if possible, a theory of Free Agency which can be reconciled with the doctrines of original sin and efficacious grace. Edwards's work is built upon a union

* Essays and Reviews, p. 434.

† Ibid , p. 436.

of the philosophical theory of necessity with the theological doctrine of predestination. The new school of our times, the *novissima*, insists upon regarding the freedom of the will as an axiom, a first truth, whose evidence goes with the statement of it. Is man an *agent*, or an *instrument*, is the question? The new school will have it, that the old school believes in physical depravity and physical regeneration, and that it antedates consciousness by responsibility, and makes us accountable before we are intelligent. The issue is not, as Dr. Hodge insists, with reiteration of phrase, that the new theology denies God's sovereignty in every gracious work; the attempt is made to lift that sovereignty, and to extend its range and workings, beyond the compression of metaphysical definitions. Professor Hodge reflects on the late Professor Stuart for having expressed himself as being shocked by the old school doctrine, "that all men are subject to death, i. e. penal evil, on account of the sin of Adam." The Princeton Professor adds, that he and his brethren believe, "that the grace which is in Christ Jesus secures the salvation of all who have no personal sins to answer for."^{*} But how will this accord with the three following assertions from the same pen,— that "the mere absence of a native tendency to God leaves the soul in moral confusion and ruin";[†] and that the withholding by God of those divine communications which Adam enjoyed, but of which God deprives us because of his sin, "is a penal evil, from which, it is true, utter ruin results, but it is the ruin, not of innocent, but of fallen human beings";[‡] and with another statement which Dr. Hodge advances as his doctrine,— that "the sin of Adam is so put to the account of his posterity that they are condemned on account of it, antecedent to any action of their own"?[§] Here is metaphysical theology with a vengeance, and we repeat our former remark, that no man would venture to offer to us such theology, if he did not rely on the unbounded capacities of metaphysics for mystifying simple truth. Professor Park says, that "it is more difficult to reconcile the New England divinity and the old Calvinism on these sub-

* Essays, &c., p. 71.

† Ibid., p. 43.

‡ Ibid., p. 44.

§ Ibid., p. 83.

jects than on any other."* Professor Stuart, as Dr. Hodge asserts, tried hard to evade the plain meaning of his own formulas on these points. If we pronounced a judgment in the case, we should assume the office of umpire between two professed advocates of Orthodoxy, an office not excluded from the scope of our charity, but not inviting to our logical skill.

The actual loss incurred by all the millions of the human family through the sin of their progenitor, the actual resources still left in human nature for meeting the demands of God's law, and the mode of adjusting the obligation under which we lie to the impaired ability with which we are born,—these are problems on which, with the help of metaphysics, endless discussions may be kept up between the Old and the New Schools. Professor Park tried the whole resources of his amazingly acute and skilful mind upon these and other problems. He tells us that we may use, in addressing the heart, language and modes of expression which may be true to the heart though false to the mind. We may excite emotions by appeals and statements which the intellect will afterwards dispute and qualify. In a word, we may have one theology for the feelings, in their ardent, illogical, earnest workings, and another for the intellect, in its cool, deliberate processes of thought and reasoning. We trust all our readers have perused that Convention Discourse of the Andover Professor to which we have more than once referred. We regard it on the score of what it boldly affirms, and of what it so significantly implies, when taken in connection with its wonderful beauty of style and its marvellous subtlety of analysis, as the most noteworthy contribution which Orthodoxy has made to the literature of New England for the last half-century. That single discourse would win fame for any preacher. It has evidently exercised Dr. Hodge beyond any heretical dose which the new-fangled system has ever administered to him. And the Princeton divine has shown almost equal acuteness in meeting the propositions of the Discourse. He tells us, without any anxiety for seeking soft words, that Professor Park has published "an attack on doc-

* Essays, &c., p. 630.

trines long held sacred"; that "he has obviously adopted his theory as a convenient way of getting rid of certain doctrines which stand out far too prominently in Scripture, and are too deeply impressed on the hearts of God's people to allow of their being denied"; and that the aim of the Discourse is "to show how the same proposition may be both affirmed and denied."* It so happens, too, that the doctrines to which Professor Park applies his ingenious method of reasoning are the very doctrines which constitute the life of Orthodoxy. The creed, he says, states these doctrines in a way suited to make them effective in addressing the heart, but the mind can by no means receive them when it analyzes them logically. The old doctrine of our utter ruin, inability, and state of doom is reduced by Dr. Park's intellect to the following logical statement,— "that the character of our race needs an essential transformation by an interposed influence of God." On this nice piece of tamed Calvinism, "cold and deadening" enough to have come from "the most chilling of Unitarian pulpits," Dr. Hodge remarks: "Certainly a very genteel way of expressing the matter, which need offend no one, Jew or Gentile, Augustin or Pelagius. All may say that much, and make it mean more or less at pleasure. If such is the sublimation to which the theology of the intellect is to subject the doctrines of the Bible, they will soon be dissipated into thin air."† The difficulty is, as Dr. Hodge shows, that Professor Park commits to the theology of the feelings, as rhetorical or impassioned statements uttered for effect, the carefully worded intellectual propositions which have been selected for catechisms and creeds as gathering up the substance of the manifold and diversified representations of Scripture. The theory, though seemingly so specious and fair, is pronounced to be radically false, vitiated by a flaw in its premises. It starts from the assumption, than which no assertion can be more diametrically opposed to the truth, that strong feeling is engaged by and expresses itself in metaphorical language; whereas strong feeling uses and demands simple, direct, naked, literal utterance. Thus, says Dr. Hodge, Professor Park

* Essays, &c., pp. 542-544.

† Ibid., p. 551.

adduces the sentence, "God, the Mighty Maker, died!" as one which excited and engaged Christian feeling may utter, but against which the intellect protests; but the truth is precisely the other way. Does not feeling recoil shocked on hearing the sentence, while the intellect by the forced ingenuities of doctrinal constructiveness tries to ratify its assertion? So the Princeton divine affirms that the only grain of truth wrought up in the theory of his brother of Andover is, that the Scripture makes use of metaphorical language,—a fact that was recognized before Dr. Park wrote. The latter divine tells us that "the theology of the heart, letting the minor accuracies go for the sake of holding strongly upon the substance of doctrine, need not always accommodate itself to scientific changes, but may often use *its old statements, even if, when literally understood, they be incorrect,* and it thus abides permanent as are the main impressions of the truth." This, Dr. Hodge says, "is a rather dangerous principle."^{*}

Nor is this all. Dr. Hodge will not allow that these tricks with language are consistent with a real, honest faith in the doctrines announced in the old formulas. And here we come to the only point which has much interest for us in this discussion. Can these earnest and able divines, who stand with us as the prime movers in the yet undeveloped scheme of the New Theology, be regarded as actually holding the substance of the old doctrines? Certainly not, we answer, as we should feel bound to hold them if we professed to receive the formulas under any sense which the fair construction of language will admit. So, too, answers Dr. Hodge. In criticising Dr. Bushnell, he says, "It is very difficult to understand what a writer means who employs a new terminology."[†] It is difficult. But we are apt to understand or infer one thing, and that is, that such a writer does not believe what is expressed in the old terminology. Dr. Hodge very bluntly affirms that Professor Park's theory "enables a man to profess his faith in doctrines which he does not believe."[‡] Equally grave is the following judgment: "There is a large class of words to which Professor Park attaches a

* Essays, &c., p. 546.

† Ibid., p. 325.

‡ Ibid., p. 543.

meaning different from that in which they are used by theologians of the Reformed Church, and he therefore unavoidably misunderstands and misrepresents their doctrines.”* And, not to leave anything to be surmised, he adds, once more: “His articles [in reply to Dr. Hodge] are to a great degree characterized by evasions and playing with words.”† Yet Princeton must be careful of its consistency, for when its divines are writing with different aims in view, they are apt to utter statements which even metaphysics cannot reconcile. Thus Dr. Hodge says: “The two sentiments of complete helplessness, and of entire blameworthiness, are perfectly consistent, and are ever united in Christian experience”;‡ and also: “It is one of the most familiar facts of consciousness that a sense of obligation is perfectly consistent with a conviction of entire inability.”§ But in the Princeton Essay “On the Decrees of God,” we read: “Every man of sense feels that he cannot justly be accountable for what he could not possibly avoid.” Now the being born in a state of complete spiritual helplessness and of entire inability seems so much like being in a condition which we “could not possibly avoid,” that we are at a loss to see how any one can feel that he is entirely blameworthy, and yet not justly accountable for it. But on the question whether “the substance of doctrine” is touched in the honorably waged contest between the Princeton and the Andover Professors, we will allow the former, who unmistakably holds the old theology, and knows what it is, to decide. He says: “To say that the sin of Adam is imputed to his posterity [the Princeton creed] is to express a different thought, a different doctrine, from what is expressed by saying [with Professor Park] that his sin was merely the occasion of certain evils coming upon his race. The one of these statements is not merely an intense, figurative, or poetic expression of the thought conveyed by the latter. The former means that the sin of Adam was the judicial ground of the condemnation of his race, and therefore that the evils inflicted on them on account of that sin are of the nature

* Essays, &c., p. 617.

† Ibid., p. 625.

‡ Ibid., p. 36.

§ Ibid., p. 252.

of punishment. . . . There is here a real distinction. These two modes of representing our relation to Adam belong to two different doctrinal systems. According to the one, no man is condemned until he has personally transgressed the law. Every man stands a probation for himself, either in the womb, as some say, or in the first dawn of intelligence and moral feeling. According to the other, the race had their probation in Adam; they sinned in him, and fell with him in his first transgression. They are, therefore, born the children of wrath; they come into existence under condemnation. It is now asserted, for the first time, so far as we know, since the world began, that these modes of representation mean the same thing.”*

Such are some of the developments of the New Theology. We believe that its latent forces and workings reach deep into the minds of many of the most devout believers and the most efficient Christian laborers in the Church of Christendom. Our friends of the old school warn us against supposing that the restlessness of a few speculative minds, here and there, indicates any failure in the power and hold of the orthodox creed as the generally accepted faith of that Christendom. We ask the liberty of being allowed to form our opinion on that point for ourselves. It certainly is a significant fact, that the very class of men, the more thorough scholars, the calmer, profounder, and more earnest and independent thinkers, who were once the builders up of Orthodoxy,—the constructors of its formulas,—should now be found, in all sections of the Church, engaged upon invalidating the doctrinal views which those formulas have imparted to the people at large. Such influences as are unmistakably working in our higher religious literature will sooner or later become popular, will work downwards. It may then be, that something will be offered to us as Orthodoxy which we shall pronounce to be better far than Unitarianism,—something which we can receive with the same sympathy of soul and cordiality of heart with which we read the writings of those who are constructing the New Theology from the ruins of the old.

The way in which free and venturesome speculations

* Essays, &c., pp. 592, 593.

in religious philosophy are received in the communions in which they originate, offers much that instructs, and a great deal that mortifies, a lover of the truth. There are of course canons of good sense and rules of caution to be recognized here; and as far as they will justify a reasonable conservatism of what is established, and a dislike of all that is unsettling and distracting, they may properly be brought to bear against some who love to open all manner of unprofitable questions. There are good reasons why all who believe in any system of religious truth may wish to be left in peace to enjoy its comforts, and to work out its conditions of duty. Especially in any brotherhood knit together by the sympathies and interests which unite a fellowship of Christians, large or small, will dissensions always be grievous. Each member is held bound to keep himself within the recognized formulas and methods of his communion. Any one who opens dividing issues, and pushes his own freedom beyond the limits recognized for liberty, and introduces seditions or revolutionary speculations, will always provoke a more exciting strife than if he assailed his brethren from without. There are eccentric, morbid, and ambitious promptings, which lead the subjects of them to raise schisms in their own fellowships. Occasionally those who would never have attracted attention or won notoriety by a quiet fidelity to duty within the rounds of professional labor, will blaze out into public fame by adopting a heresy or by stirring a strife. There are always, in a large community, enough persons of unsettled mind, or of a restless temperament, and an easy sensibility, to welcome the radicalisms of opinion. Generally, the more startling or defiant the utterance, the greater the throng, and the more keen the interest, which, till the novelty is worn away, will receive it. It is, however, in general, a very easy exercise of common sense in discerning minds to decide whether one who seeks to unsettle an established belief is influenced by a pure love of truth or by a personal impulse, a restless disquiet or a desire of notoriety. He whom the love of truth makes a heretic is modest, gentle, prudent, slow, and considerate. The reckless speculator is rash, contemptuous, and dogmatical. It may be well, therefore, that each fellowship of believers should be naturally jealous of the rise of any

heretical speculations within its own communion, when the very fundamentals of its distinctive system are put in jeopardy. It is not all theological hate that is called out and enlisted against free speculations under such circumstances. While some love freedom, others love peace. Those who are supposed to be united in allegiance to a creed, feel as if they were consolidated into a structure; their old traditions, and their venerated authorities among the departed, lying deeply buried for foundations, while all the living members are built by joint and rule into the solid walls. An heretical member makes the whole structure topple. It is dangerous to open a new window through such an old edifice, even if it be only to get more of heaven's own light and air. There is something, too, that strongly resembles presumption, as the disciples of a fossilized creed view the matter, in the attempt of any speculating mind to recast the philosophic or doctrinal formulas of a faith which have stood in honor for long ages.

Allowing all that is reasonable in the protests and the opposition with which the New Theology is received in the communions among whose more advanced members it originates, we have what is unreasonable in such opposition still left to be defined and accounted for. Were the work to our taste, we could open here a rich budget of tempting cases with which to illustrate the matter before us. But our readers know very well how all orthodox communions receive and dispose of the heresies that always have risen up among them. True, these manifest themselves in our day in so many ways, and win so much immunity from the character, position, and influence of those who advance them, that the old inquisitorial processes are somewhat relaxed. It is our firm conviction that much real dissent and free speculation is now held in prudent reserve, enjoyed and indulged secretly, but not divulged. We believe that there is relatively a vast deal more latent heresy in orthodox communions, yes, even among the professors of theological schools, than has ever existed before. We infer this partly from the tokens which manifest themselves, and partly as a natural consequence of the way in which all candid utterances of bolder minds are treated. Orthodoxy visits some of its most bitter censures upon those

within its communion who have practised concealment about their lapse from its creed, and who occasionally are entrapped or compelled unwillingly to confess the extent of their heresies. Does Orthodoxy suppose that it hunts out one in each score of these quiet and silent heretics who outwardly conform to its discipline? But then comes up the question, Is this silent dissent, this smothered rebellion, honest? Doubtless the subjects of it are perfectly easy in conscience under their secret burdens. They know the price to their own peace at which they would have to make avowals. They are consistent Protestants to the extent of believing themselves free of all human responsibility in their creeds. They too have distinguished between religion and the philosophy of religion, and have a way of satisfying themselves that they may still hold the substance of a creed though they may object to all the terms by which it is expressed. Finally, these secret heretics among the orthodox consult the edifying and practical interests of religion. They know that schisms and feuds and minor controversies among brethren are ruinous to the temper of those who engage in them, are occasions of scandal, contempt, and unbelief to the world at large, and are so much waste of the resources of true piety. The way in which Orthodoxy treats avowals of free and dissentient opinion in its communion, is a bounty on concealment.

But how preposterous is the attempt made by Orthodoxy to reconcile its demand for an unwavering allegiance to its dogmatical theology with a fair and zealous use of all the new means for the attainment of truth. Take, for instance, the blind and obstinate resistance now made in Great Britain by all orthodox sects, with the exception of a very few of the most intelligent and candid in each, to the proposed revision of our common version of the Scriptures. No one advocates a new translation, an entire substitution of another English version of the Bible. All the acknowledged beauties and excellences of the present version are to be retained. All the fond associations connected with phrase and figure and text are to be respected, except where they are manifestly wrong and misleading. Neither the Saxon vigor, nor the antique quaintness, nor the homely directness, nor the pointed boldness, of the received version is to be

sacrificed. The aim is only for a revision, for the sake of amending undoubted errors, removing obsolete words, and letting in light wherever there is unintelligible obscurity. Nor is it proposed to have this revision made under any favored sectarian auspices, to turn it into a job or a scheme for speculators or partisans, or to the service of any cause save the highest and holiest,—the edification of all persons of all classes. The advocates of the measure, being found chiefly in the liberal and progressive party, have the countenance of some wise and good men in all parties. They are all willing that the Established Church, the prelates, the Universities, should have the direction of the work, under a commission from the Parliament or the Queen. Now let any one read the religious journals of the different orthodox sects, which abound in more or less extended references to the project, and which are prevailingly and most doggedly hostile to the measure. Scan their allegations, their arguments, their reasons. Weigh their objections, mark their appeals to prejudice, their evasion of unwelcome facts, their doubtful and false assertions. If the intent of their pleadings, and the subject on which they are spent, did not claim for their writers the tolerance of a respectful regard, simply because a religious feeling, however mistaken, is involved in their opposition, one might be pardoned for using the severest language about them. But compare their opposition to this measure, and the grounds of their opposition, with their professions as Protestants. They call the Bible the Word of God, and claim liberty for all to read it and interpret it in the fear of God, assured of finding in it the way of salvation. They know that, owing to the fallibility and the imperfect means at the disposal of those who translated the Bible from the original tongues, it is not always truly rendered. They know that a large number of new manuscripts are now available for the purpose of securing a more exact text; that the Oriental languages have been cultivated by modern scholars to the very best ends; that the laws of language, the principles of criticism, the manners and customs and history of ancient times, have been so faithfully studied, that the results gained from them must be eminently serviceable in the proposed measure. Orthodoxy in its own way favors all these helps to the under-

standing of the Bible, establishes theological schools, founds professorships, furnishes libraries, and would emphatically maintain that all these means ought to be of some service, and that an improvement of them must enter into the conditions of Christian responsibility for those who enjoy them. But, marvellous is the inconsistency! Orthodoxy most resolutely withstands the palpable and inevitable consequences of its own principles and methods. The noblest result to which all these appliances of Scriptural knowledge could culminate, would be a more exact version of the Scriptures. But no. The Bible shall not be touched. Its inspiration must not be perilled. The door must not be opened, for it will never afterwards be shut. The Spirit shall pour no more light upon the Word. The detected, exposed, and convicted error, the interpolated corruption, the spurious text, shall not be rectified or expelled. The Word of God shall stand impaired and vitiated, not only by mistakes which man has unwittingly introduced into it, but by marked and evident corruptions, which he knows very well how to purify. Such is the opposition of Orthodoxy to an amendment of the version of the Scriptures in the language of the dominant race and people of Christendom,—a version, too, which has transferred its errors into the versions in all the heathen tongues into which the Bible Society or missionaries have translated it.

What hope, then, can there be for "New Theology," while so stout and blind a resistance is offered to an attempt to relieve the Bible from such errors as man's ignorance once introduced into it, though his own added knowledge is so well qualified to remove them? The hope would indeed seem faint, if our reliance was on anything less potent than the undecaying, resistless energy of truth. There is much indeed to dishearten the champions of that truth. Let any one interested in studying the issue now so intensely working, as far as it has dared to manifest itself, in the orthodox communions of Great Britain, take some pains to inform himself on the subject by reading the volumes which are issued as rapidly as will allow of a perusal. Let him take, for instance, that work of daring impudence and ignorance,— "Bible Revision and Translation: an Argument for holding fast what we have," by Dr. Cumming,— whose popu-

larity as a millenarian preacher in London and whose fecundity in issuing worthless religious books are phenomena of equally astounding character. Of this work the Rev. Dr. Burgess, the liberal and learned editor of one of the best orthodox periodicals of Great Britain,—“The Journal of Sacred Literature,”—says: “If our readers wish to see how far sheer impudence can carry a man in the field of ignorant assertion, let them read Dr. Cumming’s book. We scarcely dare write what we think of this production; but we will bring forward two out of the many literary and historical falsehoods which it contains.”*

Or take another instance. In the pages of the same valuable and scholarly journal from which we have just quoted, Dr. Tregelles publishes a most disgraceful attack, in the form of a letter, upon his colleague, Dr. Davidson, in the task of re-editing Horne’s Introduction to the Scriptures. Our opinion of Dr. Tregelles’s scholarship is so high, that the utmost stretch of our charity will not acquit him of insincerity and duplicity in that letter. He must *know* that Dr. Davidson’s allowed qualifications and abatements of the popular notion of inspiration cannot be honestly challenged. The spirit of his letter is acrimonious and bigoted. His attempt to prove that Wisdom, as personified in the eighth chapter of Proverbs, refers to Christ, is utterly unworthy of him. Dr. Burgess is to be commended for his manly, Christian candor in saying of this letter, to which he gives a place in his journal, that Dr. Tregelles “has but little sympathy with ourselves in the line of argument he has pursued. . . . We cannot now enter on the subject further, but simply protest against Biblical science being thrown back three centuries by a sort of papal intolerance. The way in which the *Record* has treated Dr. Davidson, and is treating all who cannot indorse its ignorant and bigoted views, is *barbarous*; not only unworthy of a Christian, but disgraceful to a free country.”† “The Record” here referred to is the title of a tri-weekly newspaper, published in London, as “a highly remunerative organ” of the Low Church, or *Evangelical* party in the Establishment, and so very acceptable to the corresponding party among the

* Number for January, 1857, p. 261.

† Ibid., pp. 483, 484.

orthodox Dissenters. Some plain words about this notorious and scandalous paper may be found in another of those fresh and earnest volumes of which we have been speaking. Its title is, "Christian Orthodoxy reconciled with the Conclusions of Modern Biblical Learning: a Theological Essay, with Critical and Controversial Supplements." Its author is the Rev. Dr. John William Donaldson, late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. He claims still to hold substantially the essential doctrines of his Church, but there is a bracing vigor of thought, an heroic and earnest sincerity of utterance, and an ability of scholarship, logic, and good sense brought to bear in his work upon the rotten elements of popular belief among Christians, which indicate the fullest development of that new spirit whose workings we have been attempting to trace. He is a master of his theme. Cant, superstition, bigotry, and Jesuitical agencies in religion, receive from him an honest condemnation. He is measured and dignified in assailing views under which he was educated, but which he knows to be discredited by the science and intelligence of the age. As his work has but just appeared, we know nothing of the way in which it has been received; but that way will be stormy. He exposes most ably the pretensions and fallacies and utter inconclusiveness of the views set forth by Mr. Lee in the work on Inspiration to which we have already referred. He spares none of the shams by which timid theologians attempt to cover and evade their own weak points or the heavy blows of their assailants. But his especial wrath is visited upon "The Record," before named. "The malignity and falsehood," "the pitiable weakness," "the calumnious personalities," "the nefarious conduct," "the intolerance, folly, and slanderous violence" of "this wretched journal," are indeed hard terms to be used in describing a religious paper. But Dr. Donaldson offers most melancholy and overwhelming evidence that they are not inapplicable to a journal which meets every man and every opinion, not in sympathy with its own views, with cruel abuse, or ignorant misrepresentation, or spiteful bigotry.

Take one more striking testimony illustrative of the hateful spirit by which the results of independent and serious Christian study and thought are received. The

Rev. Dr. Rowland Williams, of St. David's College, Lampeter, the author of that admirable volume of sermons entitled "Practical Godliness," is at present engaged upon a work on "Christianity and Hinduism." This profoundly interesting subject, which may task the scholarship and candor of the ablest mind of our age, with all the best helps of native talent and true culture, has been intrusted to Dr. Williams by the University of Cambridge. He is well aware that his process of treating his subject, the method of argument he will be compelled to adopt, the concessions he must yield, and the results he must accept and commend to others, will cause an intense shock to the prejudices of a blind and narrow orthodoxy. We find a letter from him to Dr. Burgess, in the journal we have just quoted, the object of which is to purify some of the vapors of the cloud which he apprehends with good reason will break in vengeance upon him. We wish that our space would allow us to transfer his letter to our pages. It would convey to our readers more forcibly than can any words of ours a conception of the pains and penalties under which the purest disciples of truth in conflict with popular error, prejudice, and superstition are compelled either to silence and heartless conformity, or made to suffer for their loyalty to a holy cause. One sentence from the letter must suffice. Dr. Williams says: "Experience has taught me that any Anglican divine who will write honestly as a scholar, in our day, does so with a halter about his neck."

But it must not be so. It is so only because the weakest and the most prejudiced yield to what is the most unworthy and unreasonable among the meaner motives that influence them. Such as these, however, profess that a zeal for truth instigates their opposition to all the free ventures and all the honest efforts of inquiring minds. Their cure is in their own hands. They must instruct their own ignorance and yield themselves up to the heart-work of the Gospel. It is not wise to try one's temper or to waste one's time upon these stiff and crabbed worshippers of the infallibility of their own prejudices. A good Providence has appointed that there shall be a change in human generations, and so that new truth shall have new fields in fresh minds. The things which are no

longer susceptible to receiving impressions become fossils and get buried, while the glorious and beautiful processes of this still young earth are wrought upon its living germs as they yield to the divine chemistry. He is no true believer, no real disciple of Christ, who identifies the everlasting Gospel with the metaphysical or doctrinal system of any age,—least of all, of any past age. Why, indeed, should we attempt to resist the maturer workings of the human mind upon the dogmas which that mind fashioned in its earlier and less competent efforts? Why should we discredit the views and convictions of our manhood, because they are in conflict with the fancies of our childhood?

Certainly the human mind must ever be allowed to range freely over that wide field of speculative theology whose blank, unoccupied spaces it has itself fenced in and bounded and divided according to its own theories. Our systems, the best of them, are but human devices, and we must be free to assail and reconstruct them. Whatever man's thought has fabricated, however fixed and unalterable the materials which it has wrought upon, will be regarded by each generation of thinkers as something which they have a perfect right to take apart, with the purpose of working over the same materials again more wisely, more truthfully. No one can examine with care the most skilfully constructed system of theology, professedly deduced from the Bible, without being reminded that the system is exposed to fallibility in every stage of its development. The common ground of accordance and sympathy among Christians will in vain be sought for in allegiance to any speculative system. The bad passions which have been enlisted in controversy, the cumbersome heaps of almost worthless literature which have been accumulated in conducting it, and the steady increase of the points of difference which it has multiplied, prove that neither edification nor harmony is to be sought in that direction. And yet, in spite of all that has been said about the resistance of dogmatism and acrimony to every venture made by scholarly and scientific criticism, the spirit of theological discussions has been, of late years, infinitely softened and dignified. This result is the triumph of true Christian sentiment over the hearts of those who are seeking

to interpret the mind of Christ. While the life which he manifested and the truth which he taught are admitted to be the best of all our materials for the construction of a system of theology, while the deepest and tenderest motive that incites the inquiries of the intellect is to come nearer to the spirit of his doctrine, we must feel that it is safer to allow than to restrain the liberty of speculative thought. We may or may not find a New Theology, but we shall be better disciples of Him whom we call our Master. That fellowship of Christians with whose doctrinal views our own assured convictions most nearly accord, have had enough of mere liberty. We are content now to forego any portion of it that may need to be renounced, for the sake of a better improvement of its glorious franchise. We therefore look with sincere and unprejudiced interest to the speculative and scholarly labors of the advanced minds in orthodox communions. The first-fruits of the as yet not fully developed or acknowledged modifications which they have already made of their system, are the production of many valuable works which are highly acceptable to Unitarian readers, and the affording of pulpit instruction in all our great cities which is wholly unobjectionable to large numbers of Unitarian hearers. May God's blessing be on their labors, to keep them loyal to him, to Christ, and to the everlasting Gospel of grace and redemption. If the New Theology shall prove to be so much truer and better than "Unitarianism" as to obliterate the sect, whose visible increase it does withstand, we are ready to welcome it.

G. E. E.

ART. II.—THE PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE OF DANIEL WEBSTER.*

By his last will and testament, executed at Marshfield on the 21st of September, 1852, Mr. Webster appointed Edward Everett, George Ticknor, George T. Curtis, and Cornelius C. Felton his literary executors; and by the same instrument he directed that the letters, manuscripts, and papers relating to his personal history and his professional and public life, which in the judgment of his son should be placed at their disposal, should be transferred to them, "to be used by them in such manner as they may think fit." With a view to the discharge of this trust, these gentlemen issued a circular letter, not long after Mr. Webster's death, inviting the co-operation of his friends by the communication of materials for the work which they intended to publish. But circumstances prevented them from executing their purpose; and subsequently, as we are informed in the Preface to the volumes before us, the letters collected by them were placed in the hands of Mr. Fletcher Webster, Mr. Webster's only surviving son. Though it might have been better, and more in accordance with Mr. Webster's wishes, if these volumes could have been issued under the immediate supervision of the friends to whom he committed the custody of his papers, not much exception can be taken to the manner in which his son has discharged this duty. Some letters of little or no interest, insignificant memorials of his attention to the management of his farms and other matters not of public importance, have been inserted; and in some respects the collection is incomplete and unsatisfactory. But we are not disposed to indulge in adverse criticism upon it, or indeed in any captious remarks. It is sufficient to say, that the volumes will be received with satisfaction by every disciple and follower of Mr. Webster,—by all who were accustomed to look to him for just and luminous expositions of the fundamental law, for comprehensive views of our national duties and destiny,

* *The Private Correspondence of DANIEL WEBSTER.* Edited by FLETCHER WEBSTER. In two volumes. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co. 1857. 8vo. pp. viii and 540, 575.

for a wise and liberal statesmanship applied to the various questions of foreign and domestic policy which arose during his continuance in public life. It is true that they will add nothing to his great fame as a lawyer and a statesman. But they reveal the depth and tenderness of his nature, the strength of his affections, the thousand graces which clustered around his social and private life. And any view of his character and services must be incomplete which does not draw largely from them for illustration.

The first volume opens with a charming piece of autobiography, written by Mr. Webster in 1829 for Mrs. Eliza Buckminster Lee, and bringing down the record of his life to 1817. Following this we have a biographical sketch of his brother, Ezekiel Webster, by Professor Sanborn of Dartmouth College. For this brother Mr. Webster entertained an affection of which history furnishes few examples, and in the dedication to the first volume of his Works he expressed a desire that the name of Ezekiel Webster might be associated with his own, so long as anything written or spoken by him should be regarded or read. The next twenty pages comprise a few interesting Personal Reminiscences of Daniel Webster, in a series of letters, chiefly from college friends. The remainder of the two volumes consists of letters from Mr. Webster, a fragment of a journal, and some memoranda kept by him, letters from other persons, and some miscellaneous papers.

The history of Mr. Webster's life is known to every American citizen,—from his birth amidst the rugged hills of New Hampshire, through his studious youth, his early manhood of struggle and incessant toil, his maturer years resplendent with the triumphs of the forum and the Senate-Chamber, to that sublime death-bed made for ever memorable by the calmness and composure with which he awaited his last hour. "Happier than the younger Pliny," to adopt Mr. Choate's fine illustration, "happier than Cicero, he found his historian, unsolicited, in his lifetime,—and his countrymen have him all by heart." We shall not attempt to rehearse the familiar story; nor shall we now enlarge upon any of its details further than it is necessary to do to illustrate the traits of character and to elucidate the pas-

sages from his correspondence which we design to bring under the notice of our readers.

It was a marked peculiarity of Mr. Webster, that even amidst official cares and public anxieties he reverted with increasing satisfaction to his early recollections, and often dwelt with affectionate interest upon the memory of his father and brother. Indeed, we remember to have heard one who knew him intimately for many years say, that he considered the strength of Mr. Webster's affections was even more remarkable than his intellectual power. This characteristic finds frequent illustration in his correspondence, and once or twice furnished an apt paragraph for his public speeches. No one can have forgotten the eloquent passage in his speech at Saratoga, where he speaks of his father's log-cabin, "raised amid the snow-drifts of New Hampshire, at a period so early that, when the smoke first rose from its rude chimney, and curled over the frozen hills, there was no similar evidence of a white man's habitation between it and the settlements on the rivers of Canada," and of "him who reared it, and defended it against savage violence and destruction, cherished all the domestic virtues beneath its roof, and, through the fire and blood of a seven years' revolutionary war, shrunk from no danger, no toil, no sacrifice, to serve his country, and to raise his children to a condition better than his own."* In a letter to Mr. Blatchford, dated at Franklin, May 3, 1846, he gathers up some pleasing reminiscences of this period of his life.

"Looking out at the east windows at this moment (two p. m.), with a beautiful sun just breaking out," he writes, "my eye sweeps a rich and level field of one hundred acres. At the end of it, a third of a mile off, I see plain marble gravestones, designating the places where repose my father, my mother, my brother Joseph, and my sisters Mehitable, Abigail, and Sarah, good Scripture names inherited from their Puritan ancestors.

"My father, Ebenezer Webster! born at Kingston, in the lower part of the State, in 1739, and the handsomest man I ever saw, except my brother Ezekiel, who appeared to me, and so does he now seem to me, the very finest human form that ever I laid eyes on. I saw him in his coffin, a white forehead, a tinged cheek, a complexion as clear as heavenly light! But

* Works, Vol. II. p. 30.

where am I straying? The grave has closed upon him, as it has on all my brothers and sisters. We shall soon be all together. But this is melancholy, and I leave it. Dear, dear kindred blood, how I love you all!

"This fair field is before me; I could see a lamb on any part of it. I have ploughed it, and raked it, and hoed it, but I never mowed it. Somehow I could never learn to hang a scythe! I had not wit enough. My brother Joe used to say, that my father sent me to college in order to make me equal to the rest of the children!"

"Of a hot day in July, it must have been in one of the last years of Washington's administration, I was making hay with my father, just where I now see a remaining elm-tree. About the middle of the afternoon, the Honorable Abiel Foster, M. C., who lived in Canterbury, six miles off, called at the house, and came into the field to see my father. He was a worthy man, college learned, and had been a minister, but was not a person of any considerable mental power. My father was his friend and supporter. He talked awhile in the field, and went on his way. When he was gone, my father called me to him, and we sat down beneath the elm, on a haycock. He said: 'My son, that is a worthy man, he is a member of Congress, he goes to Philadelphia, and gets six dollars a day, while I toil here. It is because he had an education, which I never had. If I had had his early education, I should have been in Philadelphia in his place. I came near it as it was. But I missed it, and now I must work here.' 'My dear father,' said I, 'you shall not work. Brother and I will work for you, and wear our hands out, and you shall rest.' And I remember to have cried, and I cry now at the recollection. 'My child,' said he, 'it is of no importance to me. I now live but for my children. I could not give your elder brothers the advantages of knowledge, but I can do something for you. Exert yourself, improve your opportunities, learn, learn, and when I am gone, you will not need to go through the hardships which I have undergone, and which have made me an old man before my time.'

"The next May, he took me to Exeter, to the Phillips Exeter Academy, placed me under the tuition of its excellent preceptor, Dr. Benjamin Abbott, still living, and from that time

"My father died in April, 1806. I neither left him nor forsook him. My opening an office at Boscowen was that I might be near him. I closed his eyes in this very house. He died at sixty-seven years of age, after a life of exertion, toil, and exposure; a private soldier, an officer, a legislator, a judge, everything that a man could be, to whom learning never had disclosed her 'ample page.'

" My first speech at the bar was made when he was on the bench. He never heard me a second time. He had in him what I collect to have been the character of some of the old Puritans. He was deeply religious, but not sour. On the contrary, good-humored, facetious, showing even in his age, with a contagious laugh, teeth all as white as alabaster, gentle, soft, playful, and yet having a heart in him that he seemed to have borrowed from a lion. He could frown, a frown it was ; but cheerfulness, good-humor, and smiles composed his most usual aspect." *

This yearning of the heart towards those of his own blood was no mere sentimental affection, begotten in declining years, but was a governing principle throughout his whole life. Whilst in college he paid his board "for a year, by superintending a little weekly newspaper, and making selections for it, from books of literature, and from the contemporary publications"; † and at Fryeburg, where he taught a school for a short time, he copied deeds at twenty-five cents each, after the duties of the day were finished, in order that he might not draw too largely upon his father's means, and that he might contribute something towards the education of his brother. When that brother died in the rich maturity of his powers, he wrote in the fulness of his heart to Jeremiah Mason : " You do not and cannot overrate the strength of the shock which my brother's death has caused me. I have felt but one such in life ; ‡ and this follows that so soon, that it requires more fortitude than I possess to bear it with firmness, such perhaps as I ought." § And to another friend he wrote several months later : " I have lived to be the last of a pretty large circle of brothers and sisters. It not only fills me with wonder, but with melancholy, to look round about the places of my early acquaintance. Everybody is gone. While my brother lived, there was yet something to hold to ; but now, the last attraction is gone. There was a large, valuable, and most pleasant farm which belonged to us, and which he had taken excellent care of for years, but it causes me great pain now to visit it. A new generation has sprung up around it, and I see nothing interesting to

* Correspondence, Vol. II. pp. 228, 229.
† The death of his wife.

‡ Vol. I. p. 11.
§ Vol. I. p. 477.

me but the tombs of my parents and my brothers and sisters."* To that farm, however, he delighted to go in later years, and he gave frequent directions in regard to the management of it, clearly showing how anxious he was that it should be kept in good condition. In one of his letters to John Taylor, who had charge of it, he wrote not long before his death : "Take care to keep my mother's garden in the best order, even if it cost you the wages of a man to take care of it."†

Mr. Webster possessed considerable talent in versification, which he indulged more frequently when he was a young man than he did later in life ; and some of his earliest letters are in a metrical form. A few specimens of his poetical effusions are given in these volumes. The best piece refers to the death of his son Charles, and may be quoted here in further illustration of the tenderness of his affections. Adopting the fine thought of Burke upon the death of his son, Mr. Webster gives utterance to his emotions in a strain of genuine poetry.

" My son, thou wast my heart's delight,
Thy morn of life was gay and cheery ;
That morn has rushed to sudden night,
Thy father's house is sad and dreary.

" I held thee on my knee, my son !
And kissed thee laughing, kissed thee weeping ;
But ah ! thy little day is done,
Thou 'rt with thy angel sister sleeping.

" The staff, on which my years should lean,
Is broken, ere those years come o'er me ;
My funeral rites thou should'st have seen,
But thou art in the tomb before me.

" Thou rear'st to me no filial stone,
No parent's grave with tears beholdest ;
Thou art my ancestor, my son !
And stand'st in Heaven's account the oldest.

" On earth my lot was soonest cast,
Thy generation after mine,
Thou hast thy predecessor past ;
Earlier eternity is thine.

* Vol. I. p. 480.

† Vol. II. p. 516.

“ I should have set before thine eyes
 The road to Heaven, and showed it clear ;
 But thou untaught spring’st to the skies,
 And leav’st thy teacher lingering here.

“ Sweet Seraph, I would learn of thee,
 And hasten to partake thy bliss !
 And oh ! to thy world welcome me,
 As first I welcomed thee to this.

“ Dear Angel, thou art safe in Heaven ;
 No prayers for thee need more be made ;
 Oh ! let thy prayers for those be given
 Who oft have blessed thy infant head !

“ My father ! I beheld thee born,
 And led thy tottering steps with care ;
 Before me risen to Heaven’s bright morn,
 My son ! my father ! guide me there.” *

Springing from the same deep source, and equally characteristic of the man, was his strong attachment to his personal friends. His letters to Mr. Herbert, Mr. Bingham, and other college friends, are full of the outgushings of an affectionate heart. To Mr. Mason, Mr. Everett, and to others who were intimately associated with him, he wrote with equal cordiality. The letters to Mr. Fillmore show how agreeable was the intercourse between them, and form one of the most interesting portions of the correspondence. The last letter which Mr. Webster wrote with his own hand was to Mr. Fillmore, and bears witness to the warmth of their friendship. In a letter to Mr. Everett, written only three months before his death, he says : “ We now and then see, stretching across the heavens, a long streak of clear, blue, cerulean sky, without cloud, or mist, or haze. And such appears to me our acquaintance, from the time when I heard you for a week recite your lessons in the little school-house in Short Street to the date hereof.” † In the last letter but one to Mr. Fillmore, we have a pleasing proof of his thoughtfulness for those who had been kind to him in his last sickness.

* Vol. I. pp. 376, 377.

† Vol. II. p. 542.

"Marshfield, October 17, 1852.

"**M**Y DEAR SIR,—It has been so kind in Mr. Conrad [at that time Secretary of War] to trouble himself with the concerns of my Department, in my absence, that I should be glad to show him some mark of grateful respect.

"It is a feather in the life of a public man to sign a treaty, and I should be glad that he should have the opportunity of signing one before my return. If you have concluded to submit the copyright treaty to the Senate, I propose that you suggest to him, as from yourself, but with my hearty concurrence, that he should sign it. I do not think of any other treaty we have now on hand.

"Yours, always truly,
"DAN'L WEBSTER."*

The next day he was able to write again to Mr. Fillmore, and for the last time.

"Monday Morning, October 18, 1852.

"**M**Y DEAR SIR,—By the blessing of Providence, I have had another comparatively good night, the afternoon attack coming later, and not lasting so long, and then an excellent sleep. At this hour, (ten o'clock,) I feel easy and strong, and as if I could go into the Senate and make a speech! At one I shall sink all away, be obliged to go to bed at three, and go through the evening spasms. What all this is to come to, God only knows. My dear Sir,—I should love to pass the last moments of your administration with you, and around your council board. But let not this embarrass you. Consider my resignation as always before you, to be accepted any moment you please. I hope God, in His mercy, may preserve me; but His will be done!

"I have everything right about me, and the weather is glorious.

"I do not read the newspapers, but my wife sometimes reads to me the contents of some of them.

"I fear things do not look very well for our side.

"Yours, always truly,
"DAN'L WEBSTER."†

Another trait in Mr. Webster's character which is clearly exhibited in these letters is his magnanimity towards those with whom he was brought into professional and political collision. Few public men ever more carefully abstained from the language of invective and vituperation; but when the collected edition of his

* Vol. II. p. 559.

† Ibid., p. 560.

Works was preparing for the press, he desired Mr. Everett to remove from his speeches, as far as practicable, every trace of such language. "My friend, I wish to perpetuate no feuds," he said. "I have lived a life of strenuous political warfare. I have sometimes, though rarely, and that in self-defence, been led to speak of others with severity; I beg you, where you can do it without wholly changing the character of the speech, and thus doing essential injustice to me, to obliterate every trace of personality of this kind. I should prefer not to leave a word that would give unnecessary pain to any honest man, however opposed to me." The same spirit may be seen in the following letter to Mr. Blatchford.

"Washington, January 22, 1849.

"MY DEAR SIR,— You are acquainted with a little occurrence which took place here last year, between Mr. Ogden and myself. Mr. Ogden took offence at a remark which I felt it my duty to make to the court, and has not called to see me since, when I have been in New York, as used to be his friendly habit. I do not like that any coldness should exist between myself and a gentleman with whom I have been long on friendly terms, unless such be his pleasure. The occasion has passed by; I feel no unkindness towards Mr. Ogden. I have eaten bread and tasted wine at his hospitable table in times long since past. I have never lost, and shall not lose, a just appreciation of his character, professional and personal, and shall always be far more willing to show kindness than to do injury to him or his friends.

"You may show this to Mr. Hall, and if you and he think proper, he may suggest the contents of it to Mr. Ogden.

"My real motive in this is, that if Mr. Ogden feels any degree of unhappiness at what has occurred, he may dismiss it from his mind.

"Yours, truly always,
"DAN'L WEBSTER."*

But Mr. Webster's magnanimity is nowhere shown to greater advantage than in the following letter to the Honorable Daniel S. Dickinson, of New York. The circumstances which led to their alienation may be briefly stated as follows. To a printed speech by Mr. Dickinson a note was appended containing an extract from the

* Vol. II. pp. 292, 293.

disreputable attack upon Mr. Webster by Mr. Charles Jared Ingersoll, a member of the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania. The publication of this speech, and particularly of the note, was sharply commented upon by Mr. Webster, in his speech in vindication of the Treaty of Washington, delivered in the Senate in April, 1846; and a somewhat angry conversation took place between the two Senators. But the lapse of time healed the wounds then opened, and subsequently they were led to form a more candid estimate of each other. After Mr. Webster finally withdrew from the Senate, he wrote to Mr. Dickinson upon the subject.

"Washington, September 27, 1850.

"MY DEAR SIR,—Our companionship in the Senate is dissolved. After this long and most important session, you are about to return to your home; and I shall try to find leisure to visit mine. I hope we may meet each other again two months hence, for the discharge of our duties, in our respective stations in the government. But life is uncertain; and I have not felt willing to take leave of you without placing in your hands a note, containing a few words which I wish to say to you.

"In the earlier part of our acquaintance, my dear Sir, occurrences took place which I remember with constantly increasing regret and pain; because the more I have known of you, the greater have been my esteem for your character and my respect for your talents. But it is your noble, able, manly, and patriotic conduct, in support of the great measure of this session, which has entirely won my heart, and secured my highest regard. I hope you may live long to serve your country; but I do not think you are ever likely to see a crisis in which you may be able to do so much, either for your own distinction or the public good. You have stood where others have fallen; you have advanced, with firm and manly step, where others have wavered, faltered, and fallen back; and for one I desire to thank you, and to commend your conduct, out of the fulness of an honest heart.

"This letter needs no reply; it is, I am aware, of very little value; but I have thought you might be willing to receive it, and, perhaps, to leave it where it would be seen by those who shall come after you. I pray you, when you reach your own threshold, to remember me most kindly to your wife and daughter. I remain, my dear Sir, with the truest esteem, your friend and obedient servant,

"DANIEL WEBSTER."*

* Vol. II. p. 392.

Happy would it be for the country if all who sit in Congress would follow this noble example. Happy would it be if they would imitate the not less manly tone of Mr. Dickinson's reply.

"(PRIVATE.)

"Binghamton, October 5, 1850.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I perused and reperused the beautiful note which you placed in my hand as I was about leaving Washington, with deeper emotion than I have ever experienced, except under some domestic vicissitude. Since I learned the noble and generous qualities of your nature, the unfortunate occurrence in our early acquaintance to which you refer has caused me many moments of painful regret, and your confiding communication has furnished a powerful illustration of the truth, that 'to err is human,—to forgive is divine.' Numerous and valued are the testimonials of confidence and regard which a somewhat extended acquaintance and lengthened public service have gathered around me, but amongst them all there is none to which my heart clings so fondly as this. I have presented it to my family and friends as the proudest passage in the history of an eventful life, and shall transmit it to my posterity as a sacred and cherished memento of friendship. I thank Heaven that it has fallen to my lot to be associated with yourself and others in resisting the mad current of disunion which threatened to overwhelm us; and the recollection that my course upon a question so momentous has received the approbation of the most distinguished American statesman has more than satisfied my ambition. Believe me, my dear Sir, that, of all the patriots who came forward in the evil day of their country, there was no voice so potential as your own. Others could buffet the dark and angry waves, but it was your strong arm that could roll them back from the holy citadel.

"May that beneficent Being who holds the destiny of men and nations, long spare you to the public service, and may your vision never rest upon the disjointed fragments of a convulsed and ruined confederacy.

"I pray you to accept and to present to Mrs. Webster the kind remembrances of myself and family, and to believe me friendly yours,

"D. S. DICKINSON."*

In attempting to trace to its original source this spirit of frankness and generosity in Mr. Webster's relations with others, much must doubtless be attributed to the

* Vol. II. p. 393.

self-sacrificing example of his father, and to his own early struggles. His autobiography and letters furnish many curious illustrations of the difficulties which he was forced to surmount before he had acquired a position of comparative independence. But perhaps the most striking instance of his youthful energy and perseverance is seen in the account of his introduction to the Honorable Christopher Gore.

"In the winter of 1804," he says in the autobiography, "it had become necessary for either my brother or myself to undertake something that should bring us a little money, for we were getting to be 'heinously unprovided.' To find some situation for one or the other of us, I set off in February, and found my way to Boston. My journey was fortunate. Dr. Perkins had been in the instruction of a school in Short Street;* he was about leaving it, and proposed that my brother should take it. I hastened home, and he had just then finished a short engagement in school-keeping, at Sanbornton, or was about finishing it, it being near the end of the winter vacation; and he readily seized the opportunity of employment in Boston. This broke in upon his college life, but he thought he could keep up with his class. A letter stating the necessity of the case, was sent to the authorities of the College, and he went immediately to Boston. His success was good, nay, great; so great, that he thought he could earn enough to defray, in addition to debts and other charges, the expense of my living in Boston for what remained of my term of study. Accordingly, I went to Boston, in July, to pass a few months in some office. I had not a single letter, and knew nobody, in the place to which I was going, except Dr. Perkins, then a very young man, and like myself struggling to get on. But I was sanguine, and light-hearted. He easily persuades himself that he shall gain, who has nothing to lose, and is not afraid of attempting to climb, when, if he fail in his first step, he is in no danger of a fall. Arrived in Boston, I looked out for an office, wherein to study. But then, as I knew none of the legal gentlemen, and had no letter, this was an affair of some difficulty. Some attempts to be received into a lawyer's office failed, properly enough, for these reasons; although the reminiscence has since sometimes caused me to smile.

"Mr. Gore had just then returned from England, and renewed the practice of the law. He had rooms in Scollay's Building, and as yet had no clerk. A young man, as little known to Mr. Gore as myself, undertook to introduce me to him! In logic

* "Now Kingston Street."

this would have been bad. *Ignoratum per ignoratum.* Nevertheless it succeeded here. We ventured into Mr. Gore's rooms, and my name was pronounced. I was shockingly embarrassed, but Mr. Gore's habitual courtesy of manner gave me courage to speak. I had the grace to begin with an unaffected apology ; told him my position was very awkward, my appearance there very like an intrusion, and that, if I expected anything but a civil dismissal, it was only founded in his known kindness and generosity of character. I was from the country, I said ; had studied law for two years, had come to Boston to study a year more ; had some respectable acquaintances in New Hampshire, not unknown to him, but had no introduction ; that I had heard he had no clerk, thought it possible he would receive one ; that I came to Boston to work, and not to play ; was most desirous, on all accounts, to be his pupil ; and all I ventured to ask, at present, was that he would keep a place for me in his office, till I could write to New Hampshire for proper letters, showing me worthy of it. I delivered this speech *trippingly* on the tongue, though I suspect it was better composed, than spoken.

"Mr. Gore heard me with much encouraging good-nature. He evidently saw my embarrassment, spoke kind words, and asked me to sit down. My friend had already disappeared ! Mr. Gore said, what I had suggested was very reasonable, and required little apology ; he did not mean to fill his office with clerks, but was willing to receive one or two, and would consider what I had said. He inquired, and I told him, what gentlemen of his acquaintance knew me and my father, in New Hampshire. Among others, I remember, I mentioned Mr. Peabody, who was Mr. Gore's classmate. He talked to me pleasantly, for a quarter of an hour ; and when I rose to depart, he said : 'My young friend, you look as though you might be trusted. You say you came to study, and not to waste time. I will take you at your word. You may as well hang up your hat, at once ; go into the other room ; take your book and sit down to reading it, and write at your convenience to New Hampshire for your letters.' " *

In mentioning this circumstance in a letter to Mr. Bingham, Mr. Webster adds, that, when he was introduced to Mr. Gore, that gentleman did not distinctly understand his name, and that he "had been in the office a week or so before Mr. Gore knew the name of his clerk!" † Mr. Webster was thus compelled to make his way in life without fortune, and almost without friends ; but he availed himself to the utmost of all the advan-

* Vol. I. pp. 17 - 19.

† Ibid., p. 185.

tages within his reach. Whilst in Mr. Gore's office he reported all the decisions of the Supreme Court of this Commonwealth, and of the Circuit Court of the United States, and familiarized himself with the forms and language of special pleading. He also read Vattel for the third time, parts of Lord Bacon, Gifford's Juvenal, Boswell's Tour to the Hebrides, and other professional and miscellaneous works. In his early years he was a diligent reader, both in English literature and the Latin classics; but he never acquired a proficiency in Greek, and he somewhere expresses a regret that he could not read Demosthenes in the original. There are, however, few remarks upon books and purely literary topics in his correspondence. Perhaps the most noticeable letter upon a literary question is one to the Reverend Dr. Brazer, of Salem, upon rhetorical expression. But it is too long for our present purpose; and we copy instead of it an extract from a letter to Mr. Ticknor, dated Washington, April 8, 1833.

"I have read Tom Moore's first volume of Byron's Life. Whatever human imagination shall hereafter picture of a human being, I shall believe it all within the bounds of credibility. Byron's case shows that fact sometimes runs by all fancy, as a steamboat passes a scow at anchor. I have tried hard to find something in him to like, besides his genius and his wit; but there was no other likable quality about him. He was an incarnation of demonism. He is the only man in English history, for a hundred years, that has boasted of infidelity and of every practical vice, not included in what may be termed, what his biographer does term, meanness. Lord Bolingbroke, in his most extravagant youthful sallies, and the wicked Lord Littleton, were saints to him. All Moore can say is, that each of his vices had some virtue or some prudence near it, which in some sort checked it. Well, if that were not so in all, who could 'scape hanging? The biographer, indeed, says his moral conduct must not be judged of by the ordinary standard! And that is true, if a favorable decision is looked for. Many excellent reasons are given for his being a bad husband; the sum of which is, that he was a very bad man. I confess I was rejoiced then, and am rejoiced now, that he was driven out of England by public scorn; because his vices were not in his passions, but in his principles. He denied all religion and all virtue from the house-top. Dr. Johnson says, there is merit in maintaining good principles, though the preacher is seduced into violations of them. This is

true. Good theory is something. But a theory of living, and of dying, too, made up of the elements of hatred to religion, contempt of morals, and defiance of the opinions of all the decent part of the public, when before has a man of letters avowed it? If Milton were alive to recast certain prominent characters in his great Epic, he could embellish them with new traits, without violating probability. Walter Scott's letter, toward the end of the book, is much too charitable.

"I find in one of Lord Byron's letters a suggestion, that part or the whole of *Robinson Crusoe* was written while in prison, by the first Lord Orford, (Robert Harley,) and by him given to Defoe. Is there any such suggestion anywhere else? I do not believe it. Defoe's (his true name was Foe) other works show he could write *Robinson Crusoe*. Harley has left no proof of his capacity for such a work. While on the subject of books, whither I have strayed, I know not how, allow me to say there is one I want to see. It is Johnson's *Shakespeare*. I covet a sight of that book, just as Sam. Johnson left it. His first edition was about 1765 or 1766. Did he publish a second? You are not only a man for books in general, but for *Shakespeare* in particular, and can tell me. If you have the book, I shall get a reading of it; if you have it not, I wish you would order it on my account, the next time you write Mr. Rich. I suppose the first edition was folio, but know not." *

Though Mr. Webster was quite reserved in the expression of critical opinions in his letters, there are numerous passages in his correspondence, and even entire letters, containing descriptions of scenery and remarks suggested by the various phenomena of nature. To this class of compositions belong the elaborate description of Niagara Falls in a letter to Mrs. George Blake, the well-known letter on the morning to Mrs. Paige, one on the sound of the sea to Mr. Blatchford, and indeed many of the familiar letters from Marshfield. His love of nature and the keenness and accuracy of his powers of observation, are abundantly attested in these letters. Those which were written on his occasional journeys, in particular, contain much matter of interest and value. From a letter to Mr. Ticknor, dated Lowther Castle, August 21, 1839, we copy a single extract, to show the impression produced upon his mind by the Lake scenery of England. The whole letter is interesting; but we need copy only a part of it.

* Vol. I. pp. 533, 534.

"MY DEAR SIR,— You will be glad to hear that we have found time to get a snatch at the scenery of the Lakes, with which you are so well acquainted, and which Mrs. Ticknor and yourself have so lately visited. We thought of you often, as we had 'Scarboro' Fell,' 'Helvellyn,' or 'Skiddaw' before us. We have not run the beauty of this scenery into the details, with the spirit of professed tourists, but have seen enough to convince us that there is much of beauty and something of sublimity in it. Mountain, dale, and lake, altogether, are interesting and striking in a very high degree. They are striking to us who have seen higher mountains and broader lakes. Mr. Wordsworth, in his description of the lakes, has said, with very great truth, I think, that sublimity, in these things, does not depend entirely either on form or size, but much, also, on the position and relation of objects, and their capability of being strongly influenced by the changes of light and shade. He might have added, I think, that a certain unexpected disproportion, a sudden starting up of these rough and bold mountains, hanging over the sweet and tranquil lakes below, in the forms and with the frowns of giants, produces a considerable part of the effect." *

In the spring of 1847, he made a journey through a portion of the Southern States, an account of which is preserved in a series of highly interesting letters. From one of these we take a long extract, embodying the results of his observations in the cotton-growing regions.

"Columbia, May 15, 1847,
Saturday morning, half past six.

"DEAR MRS. PAIGE,— The cotton culture was commenced in this State about the year 1795. Before that time, people lived by raising corn, tobacco, and indigo. These last articles are now scarcely raised. There is some tobacco and a little indigo down in the southeast corner of the State, but through all this region the crops are corn and cotton. Cotton is a tender plant in its early stages, and must be cultivated cleanly and carefully. When out of the ground two or three inches, the plants look very much like beans, as well in the shape as the color of their leaves. The seed is sown in rows or drills three feet apart, in common light lands, and four or four and a half in land of richer quality. On light lands it grows about two feet or two and a half high, on the bottoms four and a half or five. The yield is of course greater on the bottom lands, but the cotton itself not quite so white and valuable. It is said to be very beautiful when in blos-

* Vol. II. p. 63.

som. Each petal or flower-leaf comes out white, then turns to scarlet, and then falls. The flowers come out not all at once, but in long succession, like those of buckwheat. But the owners think the cotton looks best in the autumn, when the pod or ball opens and the wool comes out full. They say the whole field looks as if it was covered with snow, and it looks too as if the planters might pay some of their debts. On common lands the crop of raw cotton may be seven hundred or eight hundred pounds to the acre, but more than half the weight is in the seed. Two hundred and fifty pounds or three hundred of clean cotton, is a fair crop on good common lands. When the plants come up in the rows, they are thinned by the hoe, and left to stand a foot apart. The land is kept clear of weeds by the plough, and repeated hoeings. In general, the proportion of labor to land is one hand to six or seven acres, and one mule to three hands. The hoeing, being light work, is mostly done by the women. Every morning the day's work is staked out into 'tasks,' and a task assigned to each hand. On the plantations I have seen, the people do not appear to be overworked. They usually get through their tasks by twelve or one o'clock, and have the rest of the day to themselves.

"The 'settlement' or 'negro quarter,' or huts in which the negroes live, are better or worse according to the ability or pleasure of the proprietor. Sometimes they are miserable straggling log hovels. On the larger and better conducted estates, they are tolerably decent boarded houses, standing along in a row. These are near the plantations, but not always near the mansion of the owner. Provisions are distributed by weight and measure to each family once a week. They consist, in this region, of bacon, corn-meal, and molasses. Most of the slaves have gardens, or little patches of land, in which they raise sweet potatoes and cabbages, &c., and they also keep poultry and catch fish. They usually assemble on Sundays, and have somebody to preach to them.

"The cotton lands, except the bottoms, are very much worn out and exhausted. Many planters having large numbers of slaves now buy new lands in the Southwest, and send some of their slaves there. Few cattle are kept on a cotton plantation, there being no grass. Green fields are merely poetical in this region. The lands get little manure, and that little is 'pine straw,' by which they mean pine and other leaves, scraped up in the woods, and put into the barnyard. The land is recruited, in general, merely by being allowed to rest every other year, or sometimes by being planted two years, and then resting two. The picking of the cotton is a long business, as the pods on the same plant ripen at different times. It occupies the hands from

the 1st of November to Christmas. The slaves pick out the wool, put it into a little bag or basket, slung over the shoulder, and carry it to the place of collection. It is dried in the sun one day, and then ginned to get the seeds out, packed into bales, by means of screws, and then sent off to market. The profits of the year depend, of course, not only on the amount of the crop, but on the price of the article, which is liable to great variation. The raising of cotton, therefore, is an uncertain business. The wiser men begin to think of raising more corn and less cotton. The corn and cotton grow side by side, and sometimes the fields are immense. I think we saw on two adjacent plantations four thousand acres of corn and cotton, all under cultivation, and with nothing but a ditch or a bank separating the estates.” *

Scattered through these letters there are of course frequent references to the public men with whom he was brought in contact, and the questions which were then agitated. These allusions are almost invariably marked by the candid and magnanimous tone to which we have already referred. Yet it should be observed, that Mr. Webster never hesitated, upon any proper occasion, to express his decided opinion of every measure which he deemed prejudicial to the public interests, of all factious combinations to promote a particular line of policy, of every public man whose wisdom or integrity he distrusted, and of every nomination which he thought “was not fit to be made.” Many of these references are interesting and valuable, but perhaps the most attractive is an account of a visit to Mr. Jefferson, in December, 1824, a memorandum of which was subsequently prepared under Mr. Webster’s dictation. The picture of the Virginia statesman is so graphic that we copy the whole.

“ Mr. Jefferson is now between eighty-one and eighty-two, above six feet high, of an ample, long frame, rather thin and spare. His head, which is not peculiar in its shape, is set rather forward on his shoulders ; and his neck being long, there is, when he is walking or conversing, an habitual protrusion of it. It is still well covered with hair, which having been once red, and now turning gray, is of an indistinct sandy color.

“ His eyes are small, very light, and now neither brilliant nor striking. His chin is rather long, but not pointed. His nose

* Vol. II. pp. 252, 253.

small, regular in its outline, and the nostrils a little elevated. His mouth is well formed, and still filled with teeth; it is strongly compressed, bearing an expression of contentment and benevolence. His complexion, formerly light and freckled, now bears the marks of age and cutaneous affection. His limbs are uncommonly long, his hands and feet very large, and his wrists of an extraordinary size. His walk is not precise and military, but easy and swinging. He stoops a little, not so much from age as from natural formation. When sitting, he appears short, partly from a rather lounging habit of sitting and partly from the disproportionate length of his limbs.

" His dress, when in the house, is a gray surtout coat, kersey-mere stuff waistcoat, with an under one faced with some material of a dingy red. His pantaloons are very long and loose, and of the same color as his coat. His stockings are woollen either white or gray; and his shoes of the kind that bear his name. His whole dress is very much neglected, but not slovenly. He wears a common round hat. His dress when on horse-back is a gray straight-bodied coat and a spencer of the same material, both fastened with large pearl buttons. When we first saw him, he was riding; and, in addition to the above articles of apparel, wore round his throat a knit white woollen tippet, in the place of a cravat, and black velvet gaiters under his pantaloons. His general appearance indicates an extraordinary degree of health, vivacity, and spirit. His sight is still good, for he needs glasses only in the evening. His hearing is generally good, but a number of voices in animated conversation confuses it.

" Mr. Jefferson rises in the morning as soon as he can see the hands of his clock, which is directly opposite his bed, and examines his thermometer immediately, as he keeps a regular meteorological diary. He employs himself chiefly in writing till breakfast, which is at nine. From that time till dinner, he is in his library, excepting that in fair weather he rides on horse-back from seven to fourteen miles. Dines at four, returns to the drawing-room at six, when coffee is brought in, and passes the evening till nine in conversation. His habit of retiring at that hour is so strong, that it has become essential to his health and comfort. His diet is simple, but he seems restrained only by his taste. His breakfast is tea and coffee, bread always fresh from the oven, of which he does not seem afraid, with sometimes a slight accompaniment of cold meat. He enjoys his dinner well, taking with his meat a large proportion of vegetables. He has a strong preference for the wines of the Continent, of which he has many sorts of excellent quality, having been more than commonly successful in his mode of importing

and preserving them. Among others we found the following, which are very rare in this country, and apparently not at all injured by transportation: L'Ednau, Muscat, Samian, and Blanchette de Limoux. Dinner is served in half Virginian, half French style, in good taste and abundance. No wine is put on the table till the cloth is removed.

"In conversation, Mr. Jefferson is easy and natural, and apparently not ambitious; it is not loud, as challenging general attention, but usually addressed to the person next him. The topics, when not selected to suit the character and feelings of his auditor, are those subjects with which his mind seems particularly occupied; and these, at present, may be said to be science and letters, and especially the University of Virginia, which is coming into existence almost entirely from his exertions, and will rise, it is to be hoped, to usefulness and credit under his continued care. When we were with him, his favorite subjects were Greek and Anglo-Saxon, historical recollections of the times and events of the Revolution, and of his residence in France from 1783-84 to 1789."*

No one, we think, can read these letters of Mr. Webster without noticing how seldom he refers to his own great efforts. Except in the case of the College Charter, which forms the subject of a long correspondence, the Greek question, and a few other instances, he seldom announces his intention to make a speech, or alludes to it afterwards. And unless our memory deceives us, there is not the slightest allusion in any of his letters to some of the ablest and most celebrated of his speeches and forensic arguments. Occasionally, however, we get a glimpse at the method of his preparation and the particular circumstances which roused him. Thus, in a friendly letter to Jeremiah Mason, he says:—

"Washington, February 27, 1830.

"DEAR SIR,—The press has sent abroad all I said in the late debate, and you will have seen it. I have paid what attention I could to the reporter's notes; but in the midst of other pressing engagements I have not made either speech what it ought to be; but let them go. The whole matter was quite unexpected. I was busy with the court, and paying no attention to the debate which was going on sluggishly in the Senate, without exciting any interest. Happening to have nothing to do for the moment,

* Vol. I. pp. 364-366.

in court, I went into the Senate, and Mr. Hayne, as it turned out, just then rose. When he sat down, my friends said he must be answered, and I thought so too, and being thus got in, thought I must go through. It is singular enough, though perhaps not unaccountable, that the feeling of this little public is all on our side. I may say to you that I never before spoke in the hearing of an audience so excited, so eager, and so sympathetic." *

Still Mr. Webster had a just estimate of the relative value of his own performances; and his short notes to Mr. Everett whilst the collected edition of his Works was passing through the press, show how severe and correct was his taste. In one note, he says: "I have some doubts about the title. It is too long; and besides 'forensic' is a hard word. 'Arguments' usually signify addresses made to the courts. What we say to a jury is commonly in England called a 'speech,' or an address. It is worth considering whether the title might better be 'The Speeches and Writings of D. W.'" † In another, he expresses the opinion that the reply to Hayne "must be regarded as No. 1, among my political efforts." ‡ In a third, he says: "My speech of the 7th of March, 1850, is probably the most important effort of my life, and as likely as any other to be often referred to. I think, therefore, it ought to have a short name for a running title, and for popular use. I should like to have 'Union' in it in some form, and would retain the date to distinguish it from other 'Union' speeches." §

The natural force of Mr. Webster's mind, and his entire control of its various operations, are abundantly shown in the facility with which he passed from one subject to another of a very different class, turning from the discussion of questions of great public moment to the management of his farms or to the composition of a friendly letter. His farming letters are models of clearness and directness; but, with two or three exceptions, they are not of much public interest. Perhaps the following is the best.

" Washington, March 13, 1852.

" JOHN TAYLOR,—I am glad to hear from you again, and to learn that you are all well, and that your teams and tools are ready for spring's work, whenever the weather will allow you to

* Vol. I. p. 488.
† Vol. II. p. 416.

‡ Ibid., p. 415.
§ Ibid., pp. 473, 474.

begin. I sometimes read books on farming, and I remember that a very sensible old author advises farmers 'to plough naked, and to sow naked.' By this, he means that there is no use in beginning spring's work till the weather is warm, that a farmer may throw aside his winter clothes, and roll up his sleeves. Yet he says we ought to begin as early in the year as possible. He wrote some very pretty verses on this subject, which, as far as I remember, run thus : —

' While yet the spring is young, while earth unbinds
 Her frozen bosom to the western winds ;
 While mountain snows dissolve against the sun,
 And streams, yet new, from precipices run ;
 E'en in this early dawning of the year,
 Produce the plough, and yoke the sturdy steer ;
 And goad him till he smoke beneath his toil,
 And the bright share is buried in the soil.'*

" John Taylor, when you read these lines, do you not see the snow melting, and the little streams beginning to run down the southern slopes of your Punch Brook pasture, and the new grass starting and growing in the trickling water, all green and bright and beautiful ? And do you not see your Durham oxen, smoking from heat and perspiration, as they draw along your great breaking-up plough, cutting and turning over the tough sward in your meadow, in the great field ?

" The name of this sensible author is Virgil, and he gives farmers much other advice, some of which you have been following all this winter, without even knowing that he had given it.

' But when cold weather, heavy snows, and rain
 The laboring farmer in his house restrain,
 Let him forecast his work, with timely care,
 Which else is huddled, when the skies are fair ;
 Then let him mark the sheep, and whet the shining share ;
 Or hollow trees for boats, or number o'er
 His sacks, or measure his increasing store ;
 Or sharpen stakes, and mend each rack and fork ;
 So to be ready in good time to work,
 Visit his crowded barns at early morn,
 Look to his granary, and shell his corn ;
 Give a good breakfast to his numerous kine,
 His shivering poultry, and his fattening swine.'*

" And Mr. Virgil says some other things, which you understand up at Franklin as well as ever he did.

' In chilling winter, swains enjoy their store,
 Forget their hardships, and recruit for more ;

* " Dryden's Virgil, Georg. I. 69."

† " Dryden's Virgil, Georg. I. 350. Considerably altered to fit it to the meridian of Franklin.

The farmer to full feasts invites his friends,
 And what he got with pains, with pleasure spends ;
 Draws chairs around the fire, and tells once more
 Stories which often have been told before ;
 Spreads a clean table, with things good to eat,
 And adds some moistening to his fruit and meat :
 They praise his hospitality, and feel
 They shall sleep better after such a meal.' *

" John Taylor, by the time you have got through this, you will have read enough.

" The sum of all is, be ready for your spring's work as soon as the weather becomes warm enough.

" And then put in the plough and look not back.

" DAN'L WEBSTER." †

This is very pleasant letter-writing, and shows how admirably Mr. Webster could adapt himself, in his familiar hours, to persons of the most various habits of mind.

Among the letters to Mr. Webster are several of much interest from Lord Ashburton, Mr. Madison, Lafayette, Jeremiah Mason, and especially from his brother, Ezekiel Webster, whose letters are always marked by clear and just views expressed in manly and dignified language. But there is not one which we have read with more interest than the following note from Chancellor Kent, in reference to a question long since decided, but which many persons have always thought was decided in an unfortunate way. ‡

" New York, January 21, 1830.

" DEAR SIR,—I ought to have replied earlier to your letter of the 15th instant; but I have been diverted by a number of perplexing avocations, each of them, singly, petty in its nature; but conjointly such things make up the sum of the life of ordinary minds. And now to the purpose. I beg leave to decline any opinion on the question you state. 1. I have not time to do it justice and render anything I could say worthy of you. 2. I am not going to undertake to instruct a senatorial Statesman, who

* "Dryden's Virgil, Georg. I. 404. The last six lines are in playful imitation of the original."

† Vol. II. pp. 513—515.

‡ In the Life of John Adams, Mr. C. F. Adams enters into an elaborate defence of the casting vote of his grandfather, by which the question was thus decided, and makes it one of many occasions to glorify his ancestor. Mr. Webster's opinion is well known. He declared over and over again, in his public speeches and his private correspondence, that he did not believe the President possessed the power, under the Constitution, to remove from office without the consent of the Senate.

has thought upon the subject infinitely more than I have, for it comes officially before him.

"Hamilton, in *The Federalist*, No. 77, was of opinion that the President could not remove without the consent of the Senate. I heard the question debated in the summer of 1789, and Madison, Benson, Ames, Lawrence, &c. were in favor of the right of removal by the President, and such has been the opinion ever since, and the practice. I thought they were right, because I then thought this side uniformly right. Mr. White of Virginia was strenuously opposed to that construction. You will find the discussion in Feno's *United States Gazetteer* for July or August or September, 1789. Madison reasoned technically like a lawyer. Now, when I come to think on the subject, with my confirmed, wary view of things, I pause and doubt of the construction, on account of the word 'advice.' That word is pregnant with meaning, and means something beyond consent to nominations, or it would not have been inserted. The consent, so it might be argued, applies to the individual named; the advice to the measure itself, which draws to it the whole ground of the interference. Again, it is a great and general principle, in all jurisprudence, that, when there is no positive provision in the case regulating the principle, the power that appoints is the power to determine the pleasure of the appointment and the limitation. It is the power to reappoint; and the power to appoint and reappoint, when all else is silent, is the power to remove. I begin to have a strong suspicion that Hamilton was right, as he always was on public questions.

"On the other hand, it is too late to call the President's power in question, after a declaratory act of Congress, and an acquiescence of half a century. We should hurt the reputation of our government with the world, and we are accused already of the republican tendency of reducing all executive power into the legislative, and making Congress a national convention. That the President grossly abuses the power of removal is manifest, but it is the evil genius of Democracy to be the sport of factions. Hamilton said in *The Federalist*, in his speeches, and a hundred times to me, that factions would ruin us, and our government had not sufficient balance and energy to resist the propensity to them, and to control their tyranny and their profligacy. All theories of government that suppose the mass of the people virtuous, and able and willing to act virtuously, are plainly Utopian, and will remain so until the return of the Saturnian age.

"Yours very sincerely,

"JAMES KENT."*

* Vol. I. pp. 486, 487.

From the opinion expressed in the last sentence of this letter many readers will dissent; and we could have wished for a more decided opinion in answer to Mr. Webster's question. But it is clear from the whole tenor of his letter that the Chancellor's early views had been greatly modified by subsequent study.

In these remarks, and in our selections from Mr. Webster's correspondence, we have endeavored to abstain, as far as it was practicable to do so, from any reference to the political questions in the discussion of which so large a part of his life was spent. The time has not yet come for an impartial review of his political career. For nearly forty years he occupied a conspicuous position before the country; and, as we observed at the beginning, his history is known to all men. It is part of the inheritance which will go down to the remotest generations. Already the angry and unprincipled partanship by which he was so often assailed is giving place to juster and more candid views. Men who reviled him when he was living are eager now that he is dead to prop their arguments by the authority of his great name. He foresaw all this, and with the sure vision of a wise and thoughtful mind, conscious of right intentions and patriotic deeds, he left the vindication of his course to the calm judgment of posterity. "Now, gentlemen," he said in his last speech to the citizens of Boston, "from that time,—from the time I entered into the Congress of the United States, at the wish of the people of Boston,—my manner of political life is known to you all. I do not stand here to-night to apologize for it. Less do I stand here to demand any approbation. I leave it all to my country, to posterity, and the world to say whether it will, or will not, stand the test of time and truth." Noble words with which to close a long life dedicated to the service of the whole country! Who that heard them on that pleasant summer evening, with the light of the setting sun lingering on the orator's head, or who reads them now with the scene still fresh in his memory, can doubt for a moment that, however much men may have differed in regard to particular acts in his public life, it will stand the test to which he appealed, and that his name will continue to be held in increasing honor? Consider the long line of his public services, the splendid achieve-

ments of his imperial intellect at the bar, in the deliberative assembly, as a member of the Cabinet, and before the people ; consider, in a word, what he did and what he was ; and who can fail to recognize the elements of an imperishable renown ? Washington, Hamilton, Webster,—whatever other names on this Western continent may fade from the memory of men, these will shine for ever with an undiminished lustre. Framers or defenders of that matchless fabric of government under which we live, their fame is secure.

c. c. s.

ART. III.—REFLECTIONS.

MILITARY splendor resembles the glittering veil of the prophet of Khorassan.

A pen which runs too long will lose its point.

A large part of some men's reputation (to borrow an image from heat) is latent, till death shows how much more they have been esteemed than talked of.

Peace of mind is not repose ; it is maintained like the peace of society, by the constant repression of disturbing causes.

We learn our ignorance by attempting to apply our knowledge. Much of our wisdom consists in seeing how little the rest is.

A German proverb says, “A mother's love is new every day.”

Although her eye may fail with age,
Although her feet may falter,
A mother's heart is always young,
Her love can never alter.

The mind is trained for high action by the discharge of humble duties.

True philosophy has depth without darkness, but much which passes for it has darkness without depth.

The “originality” of many writers in our day resembles that of a harlequin walking on his hands instead of

his feet, perverting nature to make people stare, but accomplishing nothing valuable. Tricks of style cannot conceal poverty of thought.

Learn when to stop and where to blot,
And don't put out your piece while hot !
You'd better give it time to cool,
Than find too late you've been a fool.

It is not round sentences, but pointed ones, that stick in the memory.

The scholar lingers in the past
And lets the crowd go by ;
He turns from that which cannot last
To that which cannot die.

Departed minds abiding influence shed ;
The world is taught and governed by the dead.

Many a man does harm to win the reputation of doing good ; thrusting forward something new, labelled with his name, to displace something old which was better.

With each advance, the goal before us flies ;
Where can he rest who would for ever rise ?

Men and women of the "upper classes" often resemble household furniture made too handsome for use. They should resemble the noble instruments of science, which combine the highest polish with the highest power.

The gratifications of ambition exclude those of sympathy.

Overweening ambition makes men despise most of the world, and dislike the rest.

Political power often resembles the poisoned shirt of Nessus, consuming the favorite on whom it is bestowed.

Particular truths may be sufficiently ascertained for practical purposes ; but systems of philosophy are apt to resemble the image in Nebuchadnezzar's dream, which had feet partly of iron and partly of clay, and was broken to pieces by the first stone thrown against it.

In youth we suffer from inexperience, in manhood from care, in old age from infirmity. The circle in which a man moves enlarges as his strength increases, and con-

tracts as it diminishes, till he reels like an exhausted top, and falls and lies still.

Wickedness unpunished lures the wicked to destruction.

The beautiful hues of fiction are common light which has passed through the prism of the imagination.

Any man can make himself interesting by making himself ridiculous.

Patience is power.

Men's interests require that they should understand each other; and Providence has made it almost impossible for us to keep our real characters long concealed.

He who scoffs at our prejudices makes us think ill of him, not of them.

To avoid great mistakes, we must profit by small ones.

In most cases, the noisy notoriety of a popular favorite resembles a shuttlecock kept up by incessant effort.

How hard the luxurious toil "to gild refined gold, to paint the lily, to throw a perfume on the violet," losing high gratifications while striving in vain to exalt low ones.

The superstitions of different countries and ages vary in kind much more than in amount.

The bottom of an azure sea
Is man's abode, but who can tell
What beings in its bosom dwell?

'T is one of the triumphs of spirit and grace,
To sharpen the point of a dull commonplace.

We experience but few of the evils to which we are exposed.

Great events often make small men famous.

A book with a quaint title resembles a face with a perpetual grin.

Parents pay for their children's experience.

A man who marries a frivolous flirt "gives to airy nothing a local habitation and a name."

The modes of men's training differ more than the results; and their outward more than their inward condition. The changes which are continually going on in our outward condition tend in one respect to keep our inward condition unchanged, for they subject us continually to the trials which accompany inexperience.

If time weakens the evidence of miracles, it confirms the truths which were received on their authority.

The regard which a man pays to his words is the measure of the regard which they receive from others.

Disgust and despair follow the drunkard like his shadow.

Better be blamed for doing right, than praised for doing wrong.

Who's truly wise? The man who tries, with all his might, to do what's right.

Novelty and variety charm by exciting hope.

Ceremony is the shield of the wise and the screen of the weak.

A man engrossed by small duties is in danger of overlooking great ones.

Reforms will never produce the millennium, while they continue to be followed by new evils requiring new reforms.

If a man's first object be praise, the opinions of others must be his standard; but the leaders of mankind find their standard in themselves, and raise the thoughts of others to a correspondence with their own.

The high are praised for what the humble do unnoticed.

We cannot make others respectful or grateful by complaining that they are not so.

The young boast because they have not been tried; the old, because they do not expect to be.

To know yourself as you are known,
Observe yourself in others shown !

Men lose much of the good that lies in their way, because they will not stoop to pick it up.

We find our way through this world by light from a higher one.

To instruct or amuse, a writer must be able to look at his subject from his readers' point of view.

Men should be "lured to brighter worlds," rather than driven there.

A dwarf is a more popular show than a giant; for the dwarf makes the spectators giants, while the giant makes the spectators dwarfs.

He who suffers little from outward evils, often suffers much from anxiety to avert them. An anxious man should struggle against depressing fears. If his bark cannot dance over the waters, he should still keep her head to the waves.

"Subjective" and "objective." The subject is the perceiver, the object is the thing perceived. Objective is what belongs to the object. To see a thing objectively is to see it as it is. To see a thing subjectively is to see it as affected by the character or state of the subject. Of course man can only approximate to objective truth. Every one's views are more or less partial and prejudiced. The words correspond nearly to *apparent* and *real*.

Men's pride demands that those who wish for their favor should show that they value it by making sacrifices to obtain it. Etiquette exacts trouble.

Trifling matters are often as complicated as grave ones. Men usually cut such knots because they have not leisure to untie them. But they often give much annoyance to those who have time to spare. The easier a man's circumstances, the more leisure he has to think of his troubles.

The electric fluid, which may be drawn from our persons in shining flame, is an apt illustration of a spiritual body in the natural body.

In the present state, good and evil combine by natural affinity.

We have met somewhere with the following thought : " Though life's a troubled sea, yet every billow helps to bear us home."

The greatest rogues complain most of being slandered.

Milton's "outwatch the Bear," * was lately brought to my mind by the remark of a poor seamstress. "I have sometimes," said she, "kept on sewing till I blew out my light and sewed on by daylight."

An argument, like a cone, should have a broad foundation and terminate in a point ; but many a one that we meet resembles a cone bottom up.

Vanity makes men furnish their minds as they do their houses, for show more than for use.

Much of the pompous philosophy and poetry of our time resembles a great fog rising from a little river.

A man who angles in his own mind for good thoughts gets more nibbles than bites.

A writer becomes tame by too much effort to be emphatic. Nothing is more flat than a dead level of extravagance.

The height of meanness is to exult in its success.

Who is not distanced in the race with duty ?

We are too much inclined to look on others as machines for doing our work.

Bank-bills are make-believe money.

Applause for swerving from the right
May pass awhile for fame ;
But time, which wears the gilding off,
Converts it into shame.

* Sit up all night.

Sophistry is made more apparent by leaving out connecting particles; for those propositions which cannot stand alone are more likely to show their weakness when left alone.

“Original thoughts” are often such as wise men have refrained from presenting.

The warp of life’s the work of fate,
The filling of it ours.

Whether our lot be good or ill
Depends so much upon the will
Of others, that to give offence
Without good cause shows want of sense.

A slight outline often presents a striking likeness of a face or figure. Accident may produce the same effect, and convert a bush or guide-post or garment into a spectre.

A great many improvements consist in putting *meum* in the room of *tuum*.

Successive improvements often bring men back to the point from which they started.

Learning strengthens a wise man, but only bolsters a pedant.

The “words that burn” are those in which the rays of thought are collected into a focus.

An eminent judge of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, many years deceased, being in company with a zealous Calvinist, a conversation took place between them on the subject of original sin, respecting which they entertained very different opinions. After the discussion had continued some time, the judge remarked: “I suppose you will admit that original sin is either divisible or indivisible.” “Yes,” replied the Calvinist, “I think I must admit that.” “Then,” said the judge, “if it is indivisible, Adam of course had the whole of it; and if it is divisible, each of his descendants at this time must have so small a fraction, that it seems to be no great matter after all.”

It ought to be a pleasant thought that very many men are greater and better than one's self; for the more numerous such men are, the more likely is the destiny of our race to be a high one.

The positive degree is best fitted to produce a permanent effect, and the superlative a temporary one.

In days when the writers among us were few,
And each was acquainted with all of the dozen,
A man who came out with a cutting review
Resembled a cannibal eating his cousin.

E. W.

**ART. IV.—AN EXCURSUS ON THE EPISTLE OF PAUL
TO THE PHILIPPIANS, II. 5–8.***

5 COMMON VERSION.—“Let this mind be in you which was
6 also in Christ Jesus : who, being in the form of God, thought
7 it not robbery to be equal with God : but made himself of no
reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was
8 made in the likeness of men : and being found in fashion as
a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death,
even the death of the cross.”

5 REVISED TRANSLATION.—“For let the same disposition be
6 in you which was also in Christ Jesus ; who, being in the form
of God, thought it not an object to grasp at to be equal to God ;
7 but made himself empty, taking the form of a servant, becoming
like common men, and in mode of life being found as a
8 common man. He humbled himself, becoming obedient unto
death, the death of the cross.”

THE scope of the passage is sufficiently clear. It teaches that, in conformity to the example of Christ

* COMMENTATORS examined and referred to on the passage : — Calvinus, Beza, Crellius, Slichtingius, Grotius, Hammond, Le Clerc, Bengelius, Wetstenius, Heinrichs, Belsham, Neander (translated by Mrs. Conant), De Wette, Meyer, Wiesinger (translated by Rev. J. Fulton), Conybeare and Howson.

Also, the following WORKS : — Melancthon, *Loci Praecipui Theologici*, p. 40, Basle, 1555. F. Socinus, *Opera*, Vol. II. pp. 381, 576, Amsterdam, 1656. Pearson *on the Creed*, Art. II. Burnet *on the Thirty-nine Articles*, Art. II. Sherlock, *Discourses (on Philippians ii. 6–11)*, Vol. IV., London, 1764. Lardner, *Works*, Vol. IX. 4th Discourse *on Philippians*, London, 1838.

Jesus, we should exercise, not pride and self-indulgence, but humility and self-renunciation; that, in possession of whatever means of influence or honor, we should not aim at personal distinction, but disregard the consideration which mere station or power may give, performing kind deeds and lowly duties, and cultivating the feeling of brotherhood with the human race,—should pursue the path of obedience to God, though it lead through ignominy and suffering to death; that this is the sure way to be highly exalted in the end. But the exhortation of the Apostle has been used less for practical than for doctrinal purposes. Both the Greek and Latin interpreters, and the great majority of Protestant commentators and theologians, down to the present day, have found in it one of the principal supports of the doctrine of the Deity of Christ. The language of Calvin expresses the tenacity, though not, we believe, the temper, with which it is still held. "He who does not see that the eternal divinity of Christ is asserted in these words," he says, "is blind. I indeed confess that Paul does not make mention of the divine *essence* of Christ, but it does not therefore follow that the passage is insufficient for overthrowing the impiety of the Arians. Surely not all the devils may wrest it from me." Says Beza: "There is scarcely another passage more illustrious than this for refuting all the heresies against the person of Christ." And says Watson: "It is impossible to explain this passage in any way which does not imply our Lord's essential divinity. There is no alternative between orthodoxy and the most glaring critical absurdity." *

At some risk, we fear, of being tedious except to those interested in the history of doctrinal opinions, we seek to show that all the attempts to interpret this passage as asserting the pre-existence and Deity of Christ, are failures. Slowly but surely, especially within the last half-

Dr. S. Clarke, *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, Part I., § 934, London, 1712. Belsham, *Calm Inquiry*, pp. 82–93, London, 1811. J. Pye Smith, *Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*, Vol. II. pp. 122–148, London, 1847. Robert Hall, *Works*, Vol. III. pp. 24–28, 340–353, New York, 1833. Stuart, *Letters to Channing*, pp. 88–92, Andover, 1819. Norton, *Statement of Reasons*, pp. 191–193, Boston, 1856. Woods, *Works*, Vol. I. Lect. XXIV. Dr. F. C. Baur, *Paulus, Sein Leben und Wirken, seine Briefe und seine Lehre*, pp. 458–464, Stuttgart, 1845.

A few others will be found named in the body of the Article.

* Institutes of Theology.

century, has one “ proof-text ” after another been given up, and many more are yet to be abandoned. With the advancement and more general diffusion of Biblical science ; with the spreading conviction that it is not through moral blindness or a spirit of unbelief that so many have been unable to find in the New Testament certain doctrines popularly called Evangelical ; with a study of the Gospel more to learn and imbibe its spirit than to form a system, a better day for Christianity will at last arrive.

Ver. 5.— We follow, throughout, the Greek text of Griesbach, which differs from the Received Text only in interpunction, but agrees in this latter respect with that of Tischendorf, also with the Vulgate, Luther's and De Wette's translations. Lachmann's interpunction is that of the Received Text. *Φρονεῖτε*, instead of *φρονεῖσθω*, is in the oldest manuscript, is adopted by Lachmann, and is sustained by the use of the active voice of this verb in every other instance in Paul's Epistles. It is found in the Paris edition of Tischendorf, 1849, but the latter is adopted in the Leipsic edition of 1850. Tischendorf and Lachmann omit *γάρ*, nor is it in the three oldest manuscripts ; but it has good authority, and is to be explained as introducing an example for illustration of what had just been said in verses third and fourth.

Ver. 6.— *ὅς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, who being in the form of God.* According to Calvin,* Beza, Hammond, Bengel, Whitby, Dr. S. Clarke, Doddridge, Stuart, Bloomfield, J. Pye Smith, Meyer, Wiesinger, Conybeare and Howson, and others, the *Logos unincarnate*, “ Christ Jesus in the pre-human condition,” is the subject of this verse. According to Erasmus, Luther, Melanthon, Grotius, Le Clerc, Wetstein, Heinrichs, Norton, Neander, De Wette, and some others, the *Logos incarnate* is the subject. All the former (Dr. S. Clarke excepted), and also Luther, Melanthon, Neander, and De Wette among the latter, regard it as directly teaching, or implying, the Deity of

* Both De Wette and Meyer class Calvin with the interpreters who regard ver. 6 as spoken of the *Logos incarnate*. But Calvin very explicitly says : “ Christ, therefore, before the world was made, was in the form of God ; because he was in possession of his glory with the Father from the beginning.” Again : “ The divine essence of Christ is rightly proved from the majesty of Christ which he had equally with the Father before he humbled himself.” See Commentary on the passage.

Christ. The reasons for considering the Logos incarnate, or the historic Christ, the subject, we think, are adequately stated by De Wette as follows: "(1.) The name Christ Jesus denotes this; (2.) the discourse in vs. 8-11 is clearly of Christ dwelling on earth and exalted to heaven; (3.) only the historic Christ can be adduced as Exemplar." On the other hand, Meyer insists on the propriety of the name Christ Jesus as designating "the subject, not of the pre-human glory *alone*, but at the same time also of the human abasement and the subsequent exaltation; that Paul connects with the relative pronoun 'who' the *whole summary* of the history of Jesus, with influence of his pre-human 'habitus'; that hence v. 8-11 cannot by itself enable us to determine the subject of discourse; but the power of the *example*, which of course first in the historic Christ comes to manifestation, has its root historically and ethically just in that which in v. 6 is asserted of the condition *before* his human manifestation." We do not see that the reply is conclusive, the phraseology and argument of the Apostle being what they are. And certainly the answer to the third point fails signally just here,—that such an example could be followed only by a king descending to the condition of a subject; by a rich man relinquishing his riches and wedding himself to poverty; by such as should be in a higher state or condition of being, and should abandon it for a lower. We commence the interpretation, therefore, with what seems an antecedent demand to apply the various affirmations of the whole passage to the historic Christ. The examination of particulars will altogether vindicate and sustain this view.

The Christian Fathers took "form" in the sense of *nature, essence, state of being*, and they have been followed by many moderns,—by Hammond, Schleusner, Stuart, J. Pye Smith, Neander, Conybeare and Howson, and others. Robinson also (in Lexicon) thinks "it may have the sense of nature," though he does not here adopt it. The authorities referred to are three, as follows:—First, the Bacchæ of Euripides, l. 54, "I have changed my form into man's nature." But clearly this is the *bodily* nature of man, the outward, not the inward, essential form. Accordingly, in the opening sentence of the play, Bacchus says, "I have taken a mortal form in-

stead of a god's." (2.) The Republic of Plato, 381. c.: "Each of them [the gods] being the most beautiful and excellent possible, evermore remains simply in his own form." Here the subject of discourse is not the *nature* of the gods, but the legends of their metamorphoses. For he proceeds to say, "Let none of the poets tell us how

- 'The gods, in the likeness of strangers from other lands,
Resorting to every expedient, visit cities.'

Let none tell falsehoods about Proteus and Thetis, nor in tragedies or other poems introduce Hera changed into a priestess." (3.) Josephus, against Apion, II. 23: "He [God] is clearly seen in his works and favors, and is more manifest than every being whatsoever, but both in form and size [*μορφήν τε καὶ μέγεθος*, which Dr. Smith translates "nature and majesty," following the Latin version] is the most invisible to us. For every kind of material, though very costly, is worthless for an image of Him, and all art rude for the purpose of representing Him. Nothing resembling Him have we either seen, or can we think of, nor is it allowable to make a likeness of Him." Meyer concedes that in all these instances the word "is to be rigorously held in its literal significance," that "it is to be taken neither like *nature* or *essence*, nor *state*." Wiesinger agrees with him, and, comparing it with the Latin word "formā" by transposition of letters, remarks that "on its signification the more recent commentators are pretty much at one."

We next turn to its use in the Bible. It is found in v. 7 of this same passage in Philippians, "form of a servant," where it denotes resemblance to a servant; in what respect, and to what extent, will be considered in the proper place. Also, in Mark xvi. 12, "He appeared in another form unto two of them." Certainly this refers to the external appearance, in which Jesus seemed to them not to resemble his former self.

It occurs in various places in the Old Testament (Septuagint version) in the sense of likeness, visible shape, features, figure, aspect.

Derivatives from it are found in Galatians iv. 19, "until Christ be formed in you"; Romans ii. 20, "having the form of knowledge and truth in the law"; 2 Timothy iii. 5, "having a form of godliness." The first

expresses the intense desire of the Apostle that the Galatians might be born anew in the image of Christ, so that Christ should, as it were, look, speak, act through them, and his spirit be the law of their life. In the second text, the meaning is that of model, standard, pattern. In the last, form is expressly distinguished from substance. The word also appears in a compound derivative, Matt. xvii. 2, Mark ix. 2, "was transfigured"; Romans xii. 2, "be ye transformed"; 2 Corinthians iii. 18, "are changed into the same image." In the first, it denotes change of visible outward appearance; in the second, change from worldly manners and habitudes into the Christian, effected by spiritual renewal. In the last, with its context, there is allusion to Moses, who in addressing the Jews wore a veil over his face, that shone too brightly for their gaze, but took it off when he went into the tabernacle to commune with God face to face; while Christian believers, more favored than the children of Israel, needed not that apostles who spake to them from the Lord should put a veil on, but along with them, like Moses himself, could face to face behold the glory of the Lord, the glorious image of God which shone in Christ as in a mirror, and from which the Spirit of the Lord proceeding changes the beholder into the same image from glory to glory. (Compare 2 Cor. iv. 4, 6; John xiv. 8, 9; Hebrews x. 19-22.)

Another compound derivative occurs Philippians iii. 10, 21; Romans viii. 29; in all three of which the signification is that of resemblance in a mode or form perceived by the senses or by the eye of the mind.

Guided, then, by the universal signification, both in classic and Scripture usage, what is it to be in the form of God but to resemble him in the form or forms in which he has manifested himself? Here, indeed, the great majority of interpreters substantially agree. But as to the nature and extent of the resemblance, and the time when, how diverse and discordant the opinions! Says Erasmus (in Beza): "the appearance and figure presented to us in the flesh, in which he incidentally threw out scintillations of God, referring these always to the Father." Luther (in De Wette): "the manifestation of himself by words and works as a Lord and God, besides having also the divine nature in the divine form

which he bore.” Calvin: “the majesty which indicates God, as royal state indicates a king.” Beza: “that glory and majesty which belong to God alone, which he laid aside to assume humanity.” Grotius (with whom agree Crellius, Slichting, Le Clerc, and others): “Form does not here signify anything internal and hidden, but that which meets the eyes, such as Christ’s extraordinary power in healing all diseases, casting out demons, changing the natures of things; which is truly divine, so that Moses, who did not do so great things, was on that account called ‘god to Pharaoh.’” Sherlock: “glories proper and peculiar to the presence of God.” Wetstein: “The Son of God, after he had been beheld in human form, also appeared in the form of God in the transfiguration.” Whitby, Dr. S. Clarke, Macknight, and Dr. A. Clarke: “the majesty in which God is represented in Scripture, and in which the Logos showed himself to Moses and the patriarchs.” Storr (in DeWette): “the divine blessedness and glory.” Newcome: “the outward appearance of God before his incarnation.” J. G. Rosenmüller: “the august nature of Christ unincarnate; his divine authority and majesty illustrated by miracles.” Heinrichs: “the whole divine majesty and authority which shone from Christ’s countenance, teaching, and actions.” Lardner, adding to Grotius’s explanation: “the wonderful knowledge which the Lord Jesus showed, and the conveyance to his disciples of spiritual gifts.” Professor Norton: “the image of God, or as God; he was like God, or he was equal with God (the latter words being correctly understood); because he was a minister in the hands of God, wholly under his direction; because his words were the words of God, his miracles the works of the Father who sent him, and his authority as a teacher and legislator that of the Almighty, not human, but divine.” Robinson: “like God, as God, where the force of the antithesis refers most naturally to the divine majesty and glory.” Stuart: “the condition and state of one who is truly divine.” DeWette: “Image of God (in itself a *form*) consists, according to its *essence*, in the divine glory. Only it is questionable how Paul thought for himself of this glory according to its constituent elements. Certainly he reckoned as belonging to it the ‘grace and truth’ (John i. 14) and all the moral attri-

butes of God (*Colossians ii. 9*) ; probably also, according to the doctrine of the Church standards, omnipotence, and, as its expression, the power of working miracles." Bengel : " Form denotes not deity, but something gleaming from it; not equality with God, but something prior to it; the figure of God; that is, form shining forth from the very glory of invisible Deity. The divine nature had an infinite beauty in itself, even without any creature beholding that beauty; as in a man of sound constitution and elegant symmetry of body a beauty shines, whether it has spectators or not. Nevertheless, he who existed in the form of God is God." Meyer : " Form characterizes Christ's pre-human form of existence, the Logos with God in the fellowship of the divine glory, according to which he was God's image (as such, also, organ and purpose of the world's creation), and to which he again returned by virtue of his ascension to heaven, having now by means of his glorified body this divine glory visibly (as possessor of which he had God's form invisibly before his incarnation), in order not to be again without it at his coming, but to appear in and with it. It is the shape of God (*John v. 37*), which the Son also essentially had in his pre-human glory (*John xvii. 5*). " Wiesinger : " Form of God describes the glory of that state of existence out of which he passed to enter into that of the form of servant."

All these interpretations may be classed under four heads :— (1.) Christ in the glory of very God before the world was, and before his appearance on earth; (2.) Christ as Son of God in a pre-existent state; (3.) Christ Jesus on earth as the God-Man; (4.) The man Christ Jesus as the Son of God. Now is there anything to determine, on just principles of interpretation, which, and which alone, of these must be the true one? First, having dismissed those interpretations which give to "form" the signification of *nature*, or state of being, we say that to regard the *historic* Christ as the subject obliges us to dismiss also all those which designate Christ unincarnate and pre-existent. Secondly, the use of a word denoting resemblance does not go to the extent of affirming sameness or equality; to say that it does, commits the fallacy of arguing from resemblance in some respects to resemblance in all, and is contrary

to common observation. Thirdly, to argue from the words and works of Jesus that he was God, is to assign a cause which he repeatedly disavowed in ascribing his power and truth to the Father who sent him, and dwelt in him. Fourthly, to say, as De Wette does, that "form of God" probably indicates omnipotence, makes form denote essential characteristic, distinguishing property, substantive faculty, that is to say, *nature*, — which De Wette himself opposes and rejects. These general considerations seem to dispose of the first three classes of interpretations, and to leave only the fourth. But the full conviction that only the historic Christ is spoken of, with no reference to his Deity and pre-existence, we rest on what we have yet further to say in developing the meaning of the passage.

The "form of God," as explained by the various interpretations embraced in the fourth class is (1.) the glory of Christ displayed in the Transfiguration (Matthew xvii. compared with 2 Peter i.) This was like that of the theophanies of old, and Jesus may have had the power to bring it at any time into manifestation. Indeed, he who looks thoughtfully on Jesus seems to see, in his person among the wedding-guests at Cana, and in the fisherman's boat on the lake, and distributing food among hungry thousands, and at the home and tomb of Lazarus, nay, with basin and towel in hand, washing and wiping his disciples' feet, and amid all the circumstances of his arrest and trial and crucifixion, one "whose face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light."

The form of God was (2.) "the image of God" (compare 2 Corinthians iv. 4, Colossians i. 15); "the radiance of God's glory, the very stamp of his divine nature" (Hebrews i. 3). These appellations are connected with assertions of his dominion and power, and of his office as Head of the Church and Redeemer of the world. Now to man also is given the same appellation, "image and glory of God" (1 Cor. xi. 7), with probable reference to the account of the creation in the book of Genesis, "created man in his image." Christ therefore, the highest of the sons of God, might be set forth in a description of similar purport with *glorious image*, but expressive of a still more divine resemblance, namely, "the form of

God." Thus also John, having narrated the miracle of turning water into wine, adds, "and manifested forth his glory" (ii. 11); and in that sublime declaration, "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth," he does no more and no less than to set him forth, by office and in person, as "in the form of God." So Jesus himself said, "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father" (John xiv. 9). So Paul, when he called him "the image of God," spake, in connection, of "the glorious gospel of Christ," of "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ,"—that face in which God, too bright for direct mortal gaze, may be seen reflected, as a bright object in a mirror (2 Cor. iii. 18; iv. 4, 6). In ideas of goodness and mercy, wisdom and truth, holiness and power, we have our best conceptions of Him, who, in the noble language of the Jewish historian, "is distinctly beheld in his works and favors, and is more evident than every being whatsoever, but who in form and size is the most invisible to us. All art is rude for the purpose of representing Him." But in the person and character of his Son, and in what He has done by him to make all things new, we are enabled more truly and adequately to conceive of the Invisible One, while we behold him face to face, in the interior temple of our spiritual life. If God is love, he who perceives the divine love in Christ sees God; and with purer aspirations than those of the Stagirite philosopher after virtue may he exclaim: "O fairest pursuit in life! For thy *form*, O virgin, even to die, or to undergo severe, unrelaxing toil, is an envied destiny!" In short, the words and acts, the spirit and life of Jesus, were the DIVINE FORM in which God, by the richest and most affecting of all his methods of manifestation, has presented himself to the children of men, "all the fulness of the Godhead dwelling in him bodily" (Colossians ii. 9).

To the interpretation which refers "form of God" to the glory which shone from our Saviour's teaching, acts, and example, De Wette objects, that "it misses the right stand-point, since this appearing of the divine majesty found place in the whole life of Christ; but his being in 'the form of God' must precede, if not indeed his earth-

ly life, at least his historical career, because verses 7, 8 refer to the latter." But surely, if we take that stand-point where De Wette places it, at the baptism by John, we behold Jesus in the form of God all the way through, to the completion of his ministry. Or should any still insist, with De Wette, that "to regard 'being in the form of God' as identical with the glory shining forth during Christ's life (John i. 14, ii. 11), does not permit the stand-point to be taken before the historical close of that life," surely that very close furnishes the best place for a stand-point. Standing there, we can see how, from his first request of John, "Suffer it to be so now," to the last cry, "It is finished," he was in the form of God and shone the glory of God.

The word *ὑπάρχων*, *being*, occurs in the same participial form and grammatical construction in Luke xvi. 23, "being in torments"; also in a passage in Eusebius, V. 2, hereafter to be noticed, "being in so great repute." The sentiment may be either *although*, or *at the very time*, he was in the form of God. Meyer insists on the latter, Wiesinger on the former; but the difference is unimportant. There is no usage to sustain Bretschneider's interpretation (in Lexicon), "being now," that is, while Paul wrote, "in divine glory"; or Storr's (in Smith), "when he might have been in the divine glory he now possesses." Nor is there to be found any support for the notion of Beza, Bishop Pearson, Watson, and some others, that "*ὑπάρχων* denotes permanent pre-existence, subsisting."

οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἤγιστο, *thought it not an object to grasp at*. The word *ἀρπάγμος*, *an object to be grasped, or an object of seizure*, translated in the English version "robbery," occurs nowhere else in the Bible. The word from which it is derived is, however, of frequent occurrence, Matthew xi. 12, xiii. 19, John vi. 15, Acts viii. 39, and means *to catch up, or away, suddenly*; hence, *to seize upon what was previously not one's own*. Another derivative noun occurs, Matthew xxiii. 25, Luke xi. 39, Hebrews x. 34, in the sense of spoil, plunder, "spoiling." The word in the text occurs in the active signification of *robbery*, or *rape*, in Plutarch, and this is maintained to be the sense here in Philippians by Calvin, Hammond, Meyer, and other distinguished critics. Unquestionably this is the

primary signification of the word, as indicated by the termination *μος*. But to this active sense there is the objection urged by Le Clerc and others, that it would require a different construction, as follows: ‘who, being in the form of God, and *deeming* it not robbery, &c., made himself empty.’ The active sense, moreover, does not suit the context; for “is it not strange,” we may ask with Wiesinger, “that the Apostle should urge the Philippians to self-denying love, by telling them that Christ did not consider his being equal to God as the seizure of a possession belonging to another?” There is also the objection, urged by Erasmus and Wetstein: “What great thing did Paul attribute to Christ, if, when he was God [either] by nature [or in glory], he regarded it not as robbery, — that is, knew himself?” Calvin seeks refuge from “the cavils” of Erasmus by giving to the indicative aorist the force of the subjunctive, and asserts that Paul meant to say, “might without wrong, might justly and properly, have appeared equal to God”; in support of which he refers to Rom. ix. 3; 1 Cor. ii. 8. But the first is simply the imperfect *I was wishing*, and to the second is prefixed the particle of *condition*, which is wanting in the phrase in Philippians. Beza, not accepting Calvin’s expedient to get rid of the difficulty, urges that “the greatest mystery is contained in these words.” And even Meyer is driven at last to the same stand-point; for he asks, in the language of Chrysostom, “If Christ was God, how had he to seize it? and how incomprehensible is not this? For who would say that a certain person, being a man, did not seize on being a man? For how could one seize on being what he is?” Sufficiently perplexing questions to those who thus interpret! Sufficiently difficult also to see how such a declaration affirms our Lord’s *dignity*, as these critics maintain!

It would seem necessary, therefore, to depart from the primary, active signification, if usage permits. Now words ending in *μος* often have the signification of words ending in *μα*; that is, they have the *passive* signification. Bloomfield, who opposes this, is obliged to confess that, of some hundred which he examined, he found about *one fifth* used *passively*. Accordingly, many take the word in the sense, not of robbery, seizing an object, but of

plunder, the thing seized. If, however, "to be equal to God" must denote something which Christ previously possessed, then it makes no difference whether the word is used actively or passively. For, as Hammond says, "it is all one that he counted it no prey, prize, acquisition, or robbery, that he was equal with God." Socinus and Slichting explain, "thought it not a prey because it was a *gift*"; and Belsham says, "not his own, but given." Just the opposite, Chrysostom (in De Wette), that "Christ thought it not a prey, because he had it by *nature*." Neither of these explanations is worth anything.

A remote signification is adopted by many, borrowed from the consideration that robbers and conquerors *exult in, or hold fast, retain*, their spoil. The former is presented by Rosenmüller, Wetstein, Grotius, and others; the latter, by Schleusner (who also gives, "did not always make conspicuous, sometimes abstained from it"), Norton, Stuart, and others. Belsham and Neander render, "did not eagerly, peremptorily claim." Wiesinger, "did not say that to use the divine condition must be eagerly seized by him"; that is, "decided to give up the possession of it." An insuperable objection to all these interpretations is, that no usage supports them.

Others interpret the phrase as conveying the idea that Jesus "was not inclined to snatch to himself equality with God," but *waited* for it until after his ascension. So Bretschneider and De Wette. So also Athanasius, who says (in Wetstein), "David, having been anointed to be king, did not instantly seize the kingdom, but refrained a long time, being Saul's servant; and our Saviour, who was born king before the ages, refrained, nor deemed it an object to snatch at to be equal with God." A like thought (not the noun, but the *verb*, is used) is found in Florus, a Latin historian of the second century (in Wetstein): "The kingdom of his ancestors, which was held by Servius, he [Tarquin] chose to seize rather than wait for." We defer final decision upon this interpretation until we come to the phrase "to be equal to God."

The same signification, without the added notion of waiting, is adopted substantially by many, who render it *an object of solicitous desire, an object to be caught at.*

So Whitby, Stuart, Smith, and many others. This we regard as the true meaning, and it appears in our translation at the beginning of this Article, *did not consider it an object to grasp at*. Certainly it has philological authority, as we have seen, in the occasional passive sense of Greek words with the active termination. Nor is it destitute of support in usage. Cyril of Alexandria, of the fifth century (in Wetstein), speaking of Lot as not yielding to the excuse of the angels (Genesis xix. 1–3), says, “He did not from a weak and fickle disposition make the excuse something to grasp at” (*ἀρπαγμόν*) ; that is, he did not lay hold of the excuse in order to exempt himself from the duty of hospitality.* In this manner certainly was it understood by the writer of the Letter from the Churches of Lyons and Vienne to those of Proconsular Asia and Phrygia, A. D. 177 (in Eusebius, V. 2, Lardner, VII. p. 167) : “To such an extent,” says he, “were those confessors the followers of Christ,— who, being in the form of God, thought it not an object to grasp at to be equal to God,— that, though they were in so great repute, and had often borne public testimony, and been snatched away from the wild beasts, and had brandings and wales and wounds all over their bodies, they would not permit us to address them by the title of martyrs, but, if we did so, severely rebuked us, and with tears entreated our prayers that they might become perfect.” Heliodorus (in Wetstein and Whitby), a writer of the fourth century, speaking of Cybele’s attempt to allure Theaganes to Arsace, says that, “finding him in the temple, she made the opportunity a seizure” (*ἀρπάγμα*) ; that is, seized the opportunity. Her proposal being rejected, she exclaims, “A young man does not consider the affair an object to grasp at (*ἀρπάγμα*), nor a piece of good luck !” The corresponding Latin word *praeda* is often thus used. Says Cicero against Verres, V. 15 : “It never occurred to your mind that the symbols of office, and so great executive power, and so great decorations, were not bestowed on you in order that by the force and authority of these you should break through all the

* How Meyer finds in this quotation from Cyril authority for using the word in the sense of *robbery*, is beyond our discernment. He merely says, “So is Cyril (in Wetstein) to be explained,” and then quotes the passage in Greek.

restraints of justice, modesty, duty, and think the possessions of everybody your prey." Says Justin, a Latin historian of the second or third century, II. 5, 9 (in Wetstein): "All, forgetful of wives and children, and of a campaign far from home, were already regarding the gold and wealth of the whole East as their prey." And again, XIII. 1, 8: "The officers were regarding kingdoms and empires, the common soldiers vast heaps of gold, as an unexpected prey; the former meditating on succession to a kingdom; the latter, on an inheritance of estates and wealth." In noticing the instances quoted from Heliodorus, Cicero, and Justin, it is objected by Meyer, that "they do not fall under the same methods of representation, inasmuch as they represent the circumstance as *booty obtained*, not *booty-making*." But it is the very point in question, whether usage does not allow this? Irrefragably it does. And Meyer is guilty of the same fault of downright arbitrary interpretation, which he so often charges others with, when he says, that "the usage of speech, together with the correlation of the clause to verses 3, 4, completely excludes the meaning that *ἀπτάγματος* either by itself or by metonymy signifies *praeda*."

τὸ εἶναι Ἰησοῦς θεῖος, to be equal to God. Most interpreters, including Belsham, Wakefield, Stuart, Norton, and Meyer, regard this as synonymous with "being in the form of God." Meyer makes the distinction that "'form' marks the divine *habitus* of Christ according to his form of appearance, and 'to be equal with God' marks it according to his essence"; but he insists that "both are *really* the same." Against this, the objection by De Wette seems valid, that, if the two clauses had been intended to be synonymous, Paul would have expressed himself more briefly by the word *this*; namely, being in the form of God, he did not deem this an object to be seized. Nor does Meyer relieve the difficulty by arbitrarily putting an emphasis on the word *robbery*.

The great body of commentators also take the phrase in a sense which implies that the equality or likeness or parity was *rightfully* our Saviour's, or was *to be* his, or would have been his if he had chosen to claim it. Sherlock and Whitby render it, "to appear as God, clothed with equal glories." Dr. S. Clarke: "to be honored as God." Macknight: "to be, like God, an ob-

ject of worship to angels and men." Crelle: "equality in respect to miraculous power, virtue, and worship." Wetstein: "the opportunity of reigning, presented on the mount of transfiguration." Heinrichs: "his heavenly gifts, divinity itself shining from his face and every action." Enjedin (in Smith): "the assumption of regal dignity and power over the Jews, to which he had an unquestioned right by royal descent and divine appointment." Schleusner: "equality in nature and majesty." Stuart and Neander: "the equality he possessed with God." Norton, Belsham, Wakefield: "his equality or likeness, this divine likeness." Robinson: "equality in nature and condition." Dr. Smith: "to be on a parity with God; an object that lay before Christ, his own by right, which he might justly have claimed, and had both the authority and power to have taken." Bretschneider: "who, being now in divine glory, did not think this condition to be seized by violence and craft, but studied to show himself worthy of it." De Wette: "Christ, as he entered on his Messianic career, had the divine glory *potentially* in himself, and could have devoted himself to bringing it to manifestation in his life; but as it lay not in the aim of the redemptive work that he should receive divine honor at the beginning, so, if he had taken it to himself, it would have been a robbery, an assumption." Conybeare and Howson: "he did not think fit to claim equality with God until he had accomplished his mission."

To these, with the exception of the three last, there is the objection that the Greek word rendered "an object to grasp at" implies something seized which was not at the time rightfully one's own. No clear instance of different usage exists. For in the quotation from Florus, the full and explicit antithesis, *did not wait for*, but seized, indicates indubitably that Tarquin had no right to take it when he did. And the same usage is apparent in the quotation from Athanasius. Nay, the usage in respect to the word seems fairly to imply something seized which was not rightly to *become* one's own, and thus carries the objection to those three which we just excepted. For in Florus the *verb* "to seize" is used, which is more general in its signification than the noun derived from it. And in Athanasius, it is pressed out of its legitimate signification by force of theology, and

arbitrarily made to stand in an antithesis which does not exist in the clause penned by the Apostle.

But there is a more decisive consideration. The expression "to be equal to God," in the various forms in which it occurs, is always used *in a bad sense*. It occurs first in Genesis iii. 5: "Ye shall be like God" (Septuagint, ὡς; Chrysostom translates it *ἴσοθεῖαν*). Isaiah xiv. 14: "I will be like the Most High" (Septuagint, ὁμοιος). Daniel xi. 36: "He shall exalt himself above every God." 2 Maccabees ix. 12: "One who is mortal should not proudly meditate to be like God" (Septuagint, *ἴσοθεα*). 2 Thessalonians ii. 4: "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God or is worshipped, so that he sitteth in the temple of God showing himself that he is God."* In the same bad sense did the Jews use it when they preferred the charge against Jesus that he "made himself equal to God" (*ἴσον τῷ θεῷ*), John v. 18. And so again, "Thou being man makest thyself God," John x. 33. Similar instances are quoted by Wetstein from the classics, from which we select a single one: "Let no one of speech-endowed creatures ever seek to be also a god." (Anthologiæ, II. 48. 2.) We take a final instance from Philo's Allegories of the Sacred Laws, I. § 15 (Mangey's ed., Vol. I. p. 148; Yonge's Translation, Bohn's ed., Vol. I. p. 64), which we have seen referred to only in Gill's Commentary: "Why, since it is pious to imitate the works of God, is it forbidden me to plant a grove near the altar, yet God plants Paradise? It is proper for God to plant and build up the virtues of the soul. But selfish and godless is the mind *thinking to be equal to God*, and, seeming to act, is put to the proof in suffering. Since it is God who sows and plants excellent things in the soul, the mind which says, I plant, acts impiously." The phrase used by Philo is *ἴσος εἶναι θεῷ*, almost identically that of Paul, who was his younger contemporary. Clearly it was a strong mode of expression, used to denote extreme presumption and impiety, inordinate ambition, spiritual despotism, selfish cupidity, affectation of independence, boasting "*I plant*." Now all this, the Apostle declares, was absent from the mind of Christ. To the declara-

* Griesbach and Tischendorf exclude "as God" from the text.

tion of such a sentiment the context naturally leads. "Let nothing be done through strife or vainglory, but in lowly-mindedness deem one another superior to yourselves. Do not seek your own selfish interests, but each one the other's. For let the same mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who, though he was in the form of God, deemed it not an object to grasp at to be equal to God." In the expression of his thought the Apostle used language which was current in the Jewish writers of that age and in the classics of the Gentiles, as well as in the Scriptures, and which would therefore be easily intelligible both to his Jewish and Gentile readers, in the sense we have explained.

At the point of view here gained, it seems clear as the day, that the prevailing interpretation, which makes this sixth verse declare the doctrine of the pre-existence and Deity of Christ, is erroneous. And the interpretation by Athanasius (followed by De Wette, Bretschneider, and Conybeare and Howson), which gives to ἀρπαγμόν the sense of *object to be seized*, with the added notion of *waiting* for it, even though it should be thought to have in this respect the support of usage, yet being destitute of it and against it in the clause "to be equal to God," is therefore likewise erroneous.*

It has doubtless contributed to this error, that the example of *humility* has been supposed to be taught by the verse, and not that of *self-renunciation*. Thus Bishop Burnet, who acknowledges that "some authorities are found in eloquent Greek authors where the words are used figuratively for earnestness of desire or pursuit," adds, "If this is allowed, it puts a strange sense on the humility of Christ, that he did not seem guilty of diabolical pride." "So," continues he, "we are exhorted to be humble from the example of Christ, who did not snatch at divine adorations; who was not guilty of the sin of Lucifer, that extravagant piece of pride!" In similar strains Robert Hall, Wardlaw, Cappe, and Dr. Woods. Now put *unselfish, unostentatious* spirit instead

* Τὸ εἰναι may denote either present or future condition, according to the context. See Romans ii. 19, Philippians i. 23. Entirely arbitrary is Meyer's assertion, that the article stands before εἰναι, with allusion to "being in the form of God," to denote the *said godlikeness*. See Kühner's Grammar, § 308. R. 3, Andover ed. Also Winer, Grammatik, § 44. 3. c., Leipzig, 1855.

of “humility,” and surely it yields no “strange sense.” Put *unpresumptuous, unambitious*, in place of “humble,” and surely the example of Christ is pertinent. Too many instances are furnished by the history of the Church, and by our own observation, to show that we very much need to place before us such an example.

To the reader of the Gospels many incidents in the life of Jesus will here readily occur, which may have been present to the mind of the Apostle when he wrote, especially his resistance of temptation to worldly dominion and greatness; his instant refutation of the charge that he made himself God, or equal to God. He declared that his kingdom was not of this world; that his Father was greater than he; that not himself spake, but the Father who dwelt in him; not himself wrought the miracles, but the Father whose instrument he was. Certainly all this should make one greatly hesitate to speak of Jesus as deeming it not robbery to be equal with God. Could anything be more unlike Jesus of Nazareth? The glory of the name of martyrs, which the confessors of Lyons and Vienne rejected with remonstrances and tears, their fellow-Christians at last succeeded in attaching to them. The glory of Godhead have the disciples of Jesus attached to the name of their Master, notwithstanding his repeated renunciation of it, and the acts and spirit of his whole life, which were contrary to it, and the protestations of apostles in his name.

The interpretation we have given of the verse is sustained by the following authorities, viz.:— Melancthon: “Jesus, when sent to obey God in suffering on the cross, did not use his power against his duty.” Grotius: “Christ did not glory in his miraculous power in order to be regarded as though he were God.” Le Clerc: “Equality with God was not a thing he believed he could seize, so as to obey nobody, and do nothing, but what he might think proper.” Yates: “did not grasp at divine honors.”* Allen: “Paul contrasts the impious ambition of the pretended heroes of the Greeks and Romans with the simple majesty of Jesus, who, godlike as he was, never aspired to that sort of worship

* Reply to Wardlaw, p. 260.

from his followers."* Professor Norton, while he erroneously affirms an equality to which Jesus had a right, presents the leading thought in giving the scope as follows : " Notwithstanding he bore the high character of God's messenger and representative to men, with all the power connected with it, he was not eager to display that character or exercise those powers for the sake of any personal advantage, or of assuming any rank or splendor corresponding to his pre-eminence over all other men." De Wette and Bretschneider's interpretations sustain it so far as they maintain that it would have been an assumption, a robbery, for Jesus to take the divine honor during his earthly life. Lardner's is substantially the same with it : " Christ did not covet divine honor from men, did not act as if he were independent, did not choose his own will." Lastly, it is sustained by an authority more ancient than any hitherto quoted, Clement of Rome ; who, in his first epistle to the Corinthians, apparently giving a paraphrase of the verse under consideration, says : " The sceptre of the majesty of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, came not in the din of boasting and pride, though powerful, but in lowliness."

Ver. 7. — *ἀλλ' ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε*, *but made himself empty*. It is the opinion of many of the best critics, that the structure of the sentence, which necessarily makes this clause the second in dependence on the first part of ver. 6, forbids the rendering of *ἀλλά* in the sense of " nevertheless," which the translation " robbery " would require. Hammond also concedes, that the use of " but " renders " probable " the interpretation that Christ " did not assume so much greatness as to appear like God, or to be looked on as God," and that " this consists very well with the context."

The verb which we have translated *made himself empty*, is found in four other places in the New Testament,— Rom. iv. 14, " faith is made void " ; 1 Cor. i. 17, " the cross is made of none effect " ; 1 Cor. ix. 15, " make my glorying void " ; 2 Cor. ix. 3, " lest our boasting of you be in vain." In each of these instances, the primary signification, to make empty, to be rendered an empty thing, can be distinctly seen. Of what, then, or in what respect, did

* Discourses on Orthodoxy, p. 78.

Jesus make himself empty? Of the form of God? So insist Meyer, Wiesinger, and many others. "The context," say they, "makes this free from doubt."* But "made himself empty" is antithetic, not to "being in the form of God," but to "thought it not something to grasp at to be equal to God." Paul says, that, being in the form of God, Jesus did not grasp at dominion, did not do *that*, but he did *this*, namely, *abnegated* himself of all such dominion, and all attempts to obtain it. The antithesis is also put here by Bengel. So in the Epistle of Six Bishops to Paul of Samosata (quoted in Smith from Dr. Routh): "who emptied himself from being equal to God." So De Wette: "stripped himself of equality with God, so far as it may have stood in the power of Jesus [to be equal], not so far as he actually possessed it." Regarded, then, as antithetic to the clause immediately preceding, it means that Jesus, when it was before him to make himself full, rich, and to reign as king (compare 1 Cor. iv. 8), *renounced* all this, and made himself empty by taking the position of a servant, the obscure lot of common men, the guise, style, and habits of a common man. His condition was empty, like that described by the prophet (Nehemiah v. 13), "Every man shall be shaken out of his own house and become empty," i. e. *destitute*; empty agreeably to his own description of his condition,—"The foxes have holes and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head." He emptied himself of all desire of display, all personal advantage, all love of fame,

"That last infirmity of noble minds,"

all *self*, the hardest of all things for a man to empty himself of. There can be no objection to this view on the ground of the sinlessness of Jesus, except that which empties his *temptation* of all meaning, and his life of all force as an example. His self-emptying has therefore no reference to "form of God," except as it implies and affirms that he still had that form under all these lowly circumstances, and never was divested of it, never laid

* Meyer, having made "robbery" the emphatic word in the preceding clause, in this puts the stress on "himself," explaining, that "instead of robbing others, he robbed himself"; an antithesis, as Wiesinger justly remarks, not to be found in the context.

it aside. Being in the form of God, he took not instead, exchanged not for it, the form of a servant; but this latter was only an outer vestment, beneath which, though the world failed to perceive his glory, and to so great an extent still fails to perceive it, the spiritual eye discerns it, beaming all the more lustrosly from the midst of his lowest humiliation. He "was in the form of God and in the form of a servant at the same time."*

It is in favor of this interpretation of "made himself empty," that in every other instance in the New Testament it is always the emptying of that which was the constituent element of the thing spoken of. Thus, "faith is made void," that is, is rendered an empty thing, is no longer faith. Christ made himself wholly empty of everything implied in grasping at parity with God. Every application of the word to "the form of God," obliges the interpreter to resort to a use of it of which there is not a clear instance. He cannot render it with exactness, and often in the attempt falls into self-contradiction. Conybeare and Howson, who translate, "emptied himself of his glory," and Dr. Arnold (Letter CCLXXII.), who speaks of the "emptying of the Divinity," hold that Christ brought with him much of his glory into the flesh. Cappe,† who says that "Jesus could not have laid down, suspended, or declined the form of God," yet admits in another place that "he occasionally divested himself so far as to perform the humble office of a servant." Belsham, who affirms that Jesus "emptied himself of everything intended by similitude to God," says, two pages farther on, "he conducted himself *as though* he were totally destitute of supernatural gifts." Barnes, who, in objecting to the Unitarian view, urges that Christ never laid aside his miraculous power and moral qualities,—which is very true,—nevertheless says: "Of this [the divine nature, which he ascribes to "form of God"] Christ cannot literally have divested himself, but he did of the *symbols* of it; or a divine being may *intermit* the exercise of his almighty power";—which is only adopting the same principle of interpretation that he has objected to in his opponents. Mr. Barnes thinks, like Chrysostom and Beza before him, that "there is much in

* Lardner.

† Critical Remarks, Vol. II. pp. 228 - 313.

regard to this which is obscure." And obscure indeed it is, on the hypothesis which they and he maintain.

For the sake of completeness, we subjoin several renderings of this clause. Calvin: "not by diminishing, but by suppressing his glory, he laid it aside." Socinus: "laid aside this apparent equality." Hammond: "diminished, lessened himself." Grotius: "willingly led a needy life." Chrysostom, Rosenmüller, Robinson: "synonymous with *humbled himself*." Newcome: "made himself of no account." Beausobre: "reduced himself to the state of extreme suffering and affliction." Wesley: "appeared *as if* he had been empty, *in some sense* renounced the glory he had before the world." Whitby: "divested himself of his former glory." De Wette: "divested [entblösste, *denuded*] himself." Norton: "divested himself as it were of his powers." Neander: "concealed and disowned [the form of God] in human debasement and in the forms of human dependence." Stuart: "veiled, laid aside, his glory." Davidson: "left the glories of the heavenly state." None of these meet the exigency of the passage; and most of them are faulty through being made antithetic to the phrase, "form of God."

μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, taking a servant's form. This is the first of three participal clauses (including the clause which stands first in v. 8 of the common version), which are all grammatically and logically connected, and describe the circumstances and mode in which Jesus made himself empty. The interpretations of it are very diverse. Melancthon: "putting on mortality with a human form." Calvin and Watson: "put on our nature so that in it he might be a servant of the Father and of men." Le Clerc: "being a submissive subject of the Roman empire." Burnet: "under authority to Rome, the Sanhedrim, and to parents." Sherlock: "the common mark and character of all the creatures of God." Grotius, Hammond, and Wetstein: "a slave who possessed nothing as his own." Beausobre: "alluding to the punishment of the cross inflicted chiefly on slaves." De Sacy: "form and nature of a servant." De Wette: "antithetic to divine authority expressed in the phrase 'being equal to God,' the condition of one serving." Meyer: "a servant of God." Wiesinger: "only his re-

lation to God is expressed; the form of a servant takes the place of form of God.*

An incident related by John in his Gospel may explain the clause. At the close of the paschal supper, Jesus, rising, laid aside his outer garments, and, girt with towel, and basin of water in hand, washed his disciples' feet. He took the office, the very form and posture, of a slave. And it is remarkable that the Evangelist associates the act with a declaration equivalent to the Apostle's assertion that Jesus was "in the form of God." His language is, "Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God and went to God, rises from supper, and lays aside his garments, and, taking a towel, girt himself" (John xiii. 3, 4). So remarkable an incident must often have occurred to their remembrance. With the same scene of the Last Supper, Luke connects our Lord's remarkable words, "I am in the midst of you as your attendant" ($\delta\ \deltaιακονων$). "The kings of the nations domineer over them; not so do you; but let the one greater among you be as the younger, and the leader as one that waits" [on you] (xxii. 25). Matthew, reporting these words as uttered on the last journey to Jerusalem, adds as follows: "even as the Son of Man came not to receive attendance, but to attend [on others], and to give his life a ransom for many" (xx. 26, 27). Here seems to be the source whence Paul drew his materials for correcting the like ambitious temper among the Philippian disciples. Not that he confined himself in thought to this, but it was the particular instance which illustrated

* Meyer and Wiesinger both correctly interpret, that "this additional clause tells us that he has emptied himself in that he has taken upon him the form of a servant." This construction is also sustained by Winer, pp. 311, 315, 316. But Meyer and Wiesinger limit this to the *first* participial clause; Meyer making the second and third "not co-ordinate, but subordinate, to the first, by way of closer definition of it"; and Wiesinger only the *second* subordinate, while he connects the third with the verb following, as in v. 8 of the Common Version and Received Text. That is, Meyer means as follows: that Christ emptied himself by taking the form of a servant, took the form of a servant by becoming like men, and became like men by being found in fashion as a man. Certainly this is arbitrary. Meyer defends it by the absence of the conjunction between the first and second participial clauses. But if, as he and De Wette agree, the three are in close connection, then the absence of the conjunction only shows that they are all *co-ordinate*; that is, each and all describe the mode of the self-emptying. But see farther on, in remarks on Bishop Pearson's argument.

and brought home to his heart the general attitude of the Lord among men. It was one out of many, of which his life was full. Of course Jesus was not in nature, or in person, or condition, a servant. But in the state and person of Master, he did a servant's work.

ἐν δημοτικάτι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, literally, *becoming in the likeness of men*, that is, of *common* men. If this phrase is subordinate and explanatory of the former, it is only so far as it asserts that Jesus was not in the form of a servant in the honorable sense in which it is often used by Paul, as servant of God; but that Jesus served as a *common* man; not a *slave*, indeed, but as a *common* man enlisting himself as servant. It is also co-ordinate, and advances a step in illustrating the methods in which our Lord showed his self-abnegation. He was like one of the common people, undistinguished in general appearance among them, and undistinguishable except in endowments of soul. Grotius understands it as “alluding to our first parents, and indicating sinlessness.” Sherlock: “having the same nature, distinguished by the same specific differences.” Calvin, and Wesley, and Bengel say: “a real man, like other men.” De Wette: “so appeared as other men, not as a divine ruler,—a clause more definite than the one immediately preceding, since that might be spoken of an angel; but this says that Christ shared the condition of men.” Not the *humanity* of Christ, not his human nature, as Meyer and Wiesinger affirm, is taught, but his form and attitude and lot, as of common men.

καὶ σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος, and *in mode of life being found as a common man*. This third participial clause completes the sentence and the verse. Not only was Jesus in general like the mass of common men, but in his habits (Latin *habitus*, corresponding with the Greek noun used in the text), in style of living, external state, the whole “fashion” of his ways as he went about, he was as a common man, was treated as such by those who chanced to meet him. He exhibited no show and parade, as though one of the magnates of the land. Correctly Meyer: “there was found no difference between his own and a human appearance.”*

* In the 6th and 7th verses, Baur has found reasons for denying that the Epistle is Paul's,—against the judgment of De Wette, that its genuineness is

Ver. 8.—*ἐταπείνωσεν*, κ. τ. λ. This verse, commencing with “he humbled himself,” follows as an emphatic declaration of his still deeper humiliation; and the mode of the self-abasement is expressed in the single participial clause following, like those in the preceding verse. So far from grasping to be as God, he reduced himself lower still, by submitting, in obedient spirit, to the shameful and terrible death of the cross. The word “obedient” looks back to “servant,” and is expressive of his obedience to God in the work of serving and saving man.

Against interpreting the passage of the historical Christ, Wiesinger suggests a great many difficulties, in the form of questions,—difficulties which, he says, do not belong to the peculiar view of this or that interpreter,—

put beyond all question; and the school of criticism of which he is the head, “affirming that the Church doctrines are taught in the New Testament, press upon Unitarians the alternative, either to accept the teachings of these men, if they admit their inspiration, or to place the writings which contain them in a later age.” (See Chris. Ex. for Jan. 1856, p. 45.) Baur’s ground is, that “the Epistle moves in a circle of Gnostic ideas and expressions, unites itself to them, and, with the needful modification, appropriates them to itself.” “It is,” says he, “a well-known Gnostic conception, that in the *Æon Sophia* there arose the passionate longing to penetrate into the essence of the primal Father, in order to become one with Him, the Absolute. That *Æon* would thus with violence snatch to itself what according to its nature could not come to it, to which, therefore, it had no right,—only this whole act is something purely spiritual. The Gnostic *Æons* are the categories and ideas in which the Absolute becomes the object of the subjective consciousness, and they are thus themselves the spiritual subjects in which the Absolute makes itself subjective and individualizes itself, or [are] the subjective side on which the Absolute is not barely the Absolute in itself, but also the absolute self-consciousness. But as they are only in plurality what the Absolute is in unity, so there arises in the descending series of the *Æons* an ever greater incongruity between the consciousness, whose object is the Absolute, and the Absolute itself as the object of the consciousness. . . . The deeper they stand [in their series], so much the less able are they to embrace and apprehend it with their consciousness. So now also that *Æon*, with the whole energy of his spiritual activity, directs himself to the Absolute; he will lay hold of, apprehend it, become like it, one with it; but he undertakes thereby only something impossible in itself, something through which he overleaps the limits of his spiritual nature, and will commit, as it were, an unnatural robbery on the Absolute. Therefore, according to the nature of the case, it cannot succeed; he will become, while from this impulse of his spiritual nature he allows himself to hurry onwards, only conscious of the negativeness of his being, which the Gnostics represent by his being permitted to fall out of the Pleroma into the Renoma” (from the fulness into the emptiness or void). Now Baur affirms that “the author of the Epistle to the Philippians moves in the sphere of the same conceptions, and makes them the foundation of his representation,—only there exists this difference, that what with the Gnostics had a purely spiritual meaning, he applies morally. Hence, while with

and on such grounds he thinks that "it will come to be regarded as a fixed result of interpretation, that this classical passage treats of Christ's becoming man, and not of what was done by him as man." But Wiesinger's questions all revolve on his application of "emptied himself" to "form of God"; they all centre in the question, "How could Christ have emptied himself of his glory, when that glory irradiated his whole career?" But such difficulties all vanish with the simple explanation, that Christ did not empty himself of the glory which he had, whether actually or potentially. He possessed the glory of the form of God all the way through, in the empty, worldly *condition* he assumed.

The interpretation which excludes the Deity and pre-existence of Christ has been particularly assailed, from

the Gnostics the attempt at seizure actually happened, but was self-ruinous as an unnatural attempt, and had only something negative for its result; it could here, by virtue of a moral self-determination, not come at all to such a seizure, and the negative, which also thus takes place not as the result of an act that has miscarried, but of one that did not happen at all, is now the voluntary renunciation and self-emptying through an act of the will, a self-emptying instead of being in emptiness."

Now, there lies at the foundation of Baur's argument the assumptions,— (1.) that "form" is to be taken as "that which constitutes the distinguishing character of a higher spiritual essence, that which adequately is idea for essence"; (2.) that "to be 'in the form of God,' is of similar signification and identical with 'to be equal to God'"; (3.) that the divine honor implied in being equal to God, which it would have been robbery to snatch to himself on earth, is supposed to await him as the result of his moral probation. If our interpretation of verse 6 is correct, then are these assumptions all erroneous, and the argument built on them, however ingenious, is inconclusive. In respect to the phrase, "made himself empty," why travel so far from the context to get the *Gnostic* use of the word, when it occurs four times in epistles whose Pauline origin Baur admits, in the sense which is the intelligible and adequate one here in Philippians?

In the last two clauses of verse 7, Baur finds Docetism. "'In the likeness of men,'—so was he not truly and actually a man." Romans viii. 3, he insists, "is not parallel, because there it is the likeness of *sinful* flesh; but in Philippians the likeness extends to *humanity*,—which," he adds, "is just the difference between the docetic and orthodox view." But in Romans the epithet "sinful" is used, because sin is the subject of discourse. In Philippians, in this connection, it would carry the impression of resemblance in sinfulness, and therefore the Apostle does not use it. Once more, Baur says that " $\sigma\chi\eta\mu\alpha$ conveys the idea of an external habit, that which is soon to pass away." But why go to Docetism to understand this, when in 1 Cor. vii. 31, which Baur receives as Pauline, and to which he here alludes, the word is found in the same general signification which exactly suits here,— "the fashion (style, mode, habitus) of the world passes away." The demand to give up the authorship of the Epistle to the Philippians to a later age than Paul's, as the only alternative of not accepting the orthodox standards of doctrine, is not a very cogent one.

the point of view in vs. 7, 8, by the splendid rhetoric and fervid argument of Robert Hall. "To decline a possible distinction and lay aside one already possessed are," he says, "things very distinct, and it is not easy to conjecture why, if the former was intended, the latter was expressed." They are indeed distinct. But the supposition that the latter is expressed proceeds from the erroneous view of self-emptying as antithetic to "form of God." Mr. Hall, however, himself extricates us from the difficulty, by presenting, as necessary to the idea of humiliation, "the powerful opposition or contrast between the station to which we bring ourselves and what we might have assumed, or previously possessed." This constituent part of the idea is that which Paul actually gives, and it is both the vindication and support of the interpretation we have given. The same contrast seems to be expressed in 2 Corinthians viii. 9,—"being rich, for our sakes he became poor,"—which De Wette thus adequately interprets: "The participial clause (being rich) denotes the power dwelling in him to take to himself worldly riches and dominion, but which he nevertheless renounced, and subjected himself to poverty, as to every renunciation and self-denial. But his denial of earthly riches had the aim to impart spiritual riches to his disciples." How could De Wette miss the exact correspondence in thought between this and the expression, "thought it not something to grasp at to be equal to God, but made himself empty"?

Mr. Hall also finds "a failure at the very outset, from the total absence of that bold and striking contrast which the first member of v. 6 leads us to expect." Where can there be found a greater contrast than between Jesus walking on the sea, stilling the winds, and in the posture of a servant washing his disciples' feet? between his transfigured person on the mount, and that meek form under the insults of Jews and Roman soldiers in the chief-priest's palace and in the governor's judgment-hall? What more amazing than his condescension, not from, but in, all his moral grandeur and stupendous power, to life's lowly duties and sufferings! What dignity in humble state! An example how much more needed by rich and poor, mighty and ignoble, than of descent from Godhead to humanity!

Mr. Hall finally objects, that "Jesus, instead of affording an unparalleled instance of condescending benevolence, is thus the greatest example of eminent virtue conducting to illustrious honor the world ever witnessed." This is indeed one of the lessons of the exhortation, coming out in full emphasis in verse eleventh. His glorious image of God may at first seem hid amid his poverty and meanness, and extinguished in ignominy on the cross; but at last it appears, itself irradiating these, and shows a bright path heavenward, for all who follow his footsteps.

From the same verses Bishop Pearson derives an argument, which he presents in the form of three propositions:—" (1.) Christ was in the form of a servant as soon as he was made man; (2.) He was in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant; (3.) He therefore did as truly and really subsist in the divine nature as in the form of a servant, or nature of a man." The first proposition the Bishop proves thus. "Our translation," says he, "is inexact and disadvantageous for expressing the truth that he took on him the form of a servant of God in that he was thus made man. If any doubt how Christ thus emptied himself, the text will satisfy him that it was by taking the form of a servant." Very true, thus far. But the argument proceeds: "If any question how he took the form of a servant, the Apostle's solution is, by being made in the likeness of men." This solution is the Bishop's, not the Apostle's; and still later, as we have already remarked in a preceding note, it is the solution of Meyer and of Wiesinger. But such a rendering would make necessary both a change in the grammatical construction, and an interpolation of another clause. It must in that case read, "He made himself empty by taking the form of a servant; he took the form of a servant by being made in the likeness of men,"—which is certainly a very different reading from the text itself. "By the likeness," proceeds the Bishop, "is infallibly meant the real *nature* of man." From such premises the inference is not a very conclusive one, that "as surely as Christ was essentially man, so certainly he was really and essentially God. Therefore it necessarily followeth that Christ had a real existence

before he was begotten of the Virgin, and was truly, really, and properly God."*

Bishop Sherlock, to whom Dr. Woods expresses himself "specially indebted for" his "own remarks on the passage," has also three propositions:—“(1.) If Christ was not better than a servant *before* he was a servant, his being a servant was his lot, not his choice. He was no more humble in being born a servant, than others born to the same state. (2.) He was in possession of whatever belonged to his state of dignity *before* he underwent anything belonging to his humiliation. For his descending is the very act and ground of his humility. (3.) His exaltation, being the effect of his humility, could not be antecedent to it. Consequently his natural state of dignity and acquired state of exaltation are two perfectly distinct states. Whence it follows, his being in the form of God, the dignity he was possessed of before his humiliation, does not belong to him in virtue of anything he did and suffered, nor is part of the glory to which he was exalted.” Against the Bishop’s first proposition we put the “contrast,” which, Mr. Hall concedes, satisfies our feeling of what is “necessary to the idea of humiliation,” namely, “the station to which we bring ourselves and what we might have assumed.” Jesus brought himself to the condition of a common man, performed the lowly duties of a servant: he might have assumed the state of a king! To the second proposition, in which Smith, Hall, and many others, as well as Woods, follow Sherlock, we reply, that, distinguishing between Christ’s state of moral dignity, or his office of Son and Ambassador of God, on the one hand, and his external low estate on the other, which these writers confound, the renunciation by him of a worldly state and position corresponding to his moral pre-eminence only proves that he was in the form of God all the time he was in the likeness of men. Or, taking our point of view at the beginning of his public career, and regarding

* Mr. Watson, whose name we have mentioned in the commencement of this article, says, in reference to the above solution, “as Bishop Pearson irresistibly argues.” Mr. Watson’s power to discern a “critical absurdity” is displayed in comparing Philippians ii. 6 with Hebrews i. 3,—in respect to which he asks, “How could Christ *expressly* resemble God, if he were not himself almighty and omniscient?”

him as then in the form of God, as he truly was, we say that "he was in the possession of whatever belonged to his state of dignity *before* he underwent anything belonging to his humiliation." But the descent to an external state of humiliation subsequently to his baptism is no proof that, before the world was created, he was in that state of dignity,—that is, in the form of God. To the third proposition we entirely assent,—unless we add, for the sake of freedom from ambiguity, that, although our Saviour's antecedent glory is not a part of that to which he was exalted, it is not to be considered *apart from* it, but both together constitute that which he enjoys in his state of exaltation.

To recapitulate and sum up our interpretation: Let Christians cherish the same disposition with their Lord Jesus Christ, who, though he was in the form in which God has manifested himself to men, and was God's own purest manifestation in grace, truth, and power, yet aspired to no deification, sought no worldly rank and wealth, was inflated by no spiritual pride, aimed at no selfish pre-eminence, indulged in no rivalries, but renounced all this, made himself empty of it, empty also of earthly comforts and satisfactions, empty in contrast with those who seek to be full, and rich, and to reign as kings; and did all this by choosing and entering upon an earthly state in which he performed the work of a servant of those whose Lord and Master he was, undistinguished outwardly from the mass of men of whom he was immeasurably the superior, and in every respect as to mode of life was as a common man. He reduced himself lower still by submitting obediently, in the service and for the redemption of mankind, to an ignominious and torturing death,—the death of the malefactor and slave inflicted on Him who knew no sin and was Lord of all! Wardlaw and Woods with one accord affirm that "the unnatural and vapid tameness of" what they have thought fit to denominate "the Socinian interpretation, is sufficient to condemn it, and paralyzes the whole strength of the passage." From their point of view it may seem so, but certainly far otherwise does it appear to ourselves. One thing assuredly will at last be clearly seen, and being seen will draw the beholder into its likeness,—the divine form of Jesus, neither con-

cealed, nor capable of being concealed, amid all the obscuration of his earthly lot, and all the intricacies of theological dispute, and all the perplexities of criticism in which the record of his life and teachings, and the writings of his apostles, have been involved. The purity of heart, which shall grow by communion with him, shall also enable us more and more clearly to see both him, and God who sent him. His spirit, diffused with his truth,—his lowly, self-denying, unworldly, sympathizing, obedient spirit,—will best reveal his true glory, and, revealing it, awaken the hope that we shall share it in that world to which he ascended from the cross. Every fresh contemplation of the scenes and events of his self-renouncing life, to the last agony of the cross, while the same disposition is cherished in us and manifested, shall call forth still heartier response to those sublime words with which the Apostle concludes the passage we have sought to unfold: “Wherefore also God hath highly exalted him, and bestowed on him a name which is above every name, that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of creatures in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.”

N. S. F.

ART. V.—M. REMUSAT ON UNITARIANS AND UNITARIANISM.*

IT is interesting to compare the various judgments given by French authorities upon the Unitarian faith and system. To one this faith is a source of amusement, to another an object of pity, to another a convenient solution of the existence of evil and the diffusion of error. One praises it for deeds which it has not done, another denounces it for sins of which it is utterly unconscious. That saintly courtier, amiable zealot, and tedious reasoner, Count Agenor de Gasparin, the Evelyn

* *Revue des Deux Mondes.* 15^{me} Septembre, 1 Octobre, 1856. *Des Controverses Religieuses en Angleterre.* Par M. CHARLES DE REMUSAT.

of French Calvinism, is pleased to discover in Unitarianism the origin and the nourishment of modern necromancy. The table-tippers in France, as he states the matter, are naturally "the Ultramontane party," the hard-shell Romanists, whom he as a sound Reformer has favored with a "special refutation"; while in America, they are "the Unitarians who demand of the spirits the promulgation of a philosophical religion, a Christianity without Christ; adversaries of the faith, they *abandon themselves, as might have been expected*, to a prodigious credulity, and launch out on the ocean of the supernatural."

On the other hand, that moderate colleague of M. Coquerel in the Paris Consistoire, M. Grandpierre, whose honest dimness of vision and whose venerable prejudices might be concisely expressed by a slight modification of his name, can see in Unitarianism only barrenness and stagnation; a dull, uninteresting formalism, which holds to proprieties and abjures all movement, excitement, and propagandism; a negation which is in America, as in Europe, utterly unfruitful. He admits that it holds a respectable social position, that its preachers are cultivated men, and that it has a fair part in the literary history of the New World; but as a form of religion, he is pained to think that it must be considered a failure. We have not learned that M. Coquerel has consented to modify his views from the hints of his "Pasteur-suffragant," or has relinquished his sympathies with a heresy so "unfruitful."

The opinion of M. Grandpierre is evidently not shared by the learned and sagacious M. Isambert, whose information on American affairs is, for a Frenchman, remarkably accurate. In his sketch of the life of Channing, in the new "Biographie Universelle," he sets forth the services of the Unitarian "reformer" in such a light that there can be no doubt of his own religious preference. There is no word of reproach or of criticism for the attacks of this bold "Socinian," but rather, in presenting a summary of Channing's view, the writer makes an argument for the Unitarian faith. He calls the work of Channing a "*religious*" work, and mentions with apparent pleasure, that France is sufficiently civilized for Unitarians as Christians to profess

their faith without being persecuted. He gives no intimation that the faith which Channing inaugurated is either prone to marvels or waning to inevitable death.

Passing by such critics as M. Jules Janin, such sketchers as M. Philarite Chasles, and such theologians as M. Léon Pilatte, we find the latest instance of French judgment of Unitarianism in two finished and elaborate articles of the leading review of Paris. The good sense, the candor, the moderation, and the scholarship are such as we might expect from the author of the great work on Anselm of Canterbury, and the greater work on Abelard and his influence. M. Charles de Remusat is one of the ablest of those remarkable men who continue to the French Academy its pre-eminent fame among the societies of the world, whose genius is not burdened by their vast erudition, and whose graceful writing makes even dry metaphysics clear and attractive. A lover of philosophy, he is as ready to deal with facts, and to appreciate the claim and position of all the sects. Catholic in his own faith, he believes in sincere inquiry, has no rebuke for the idea of progress, and rejoices to recognize the worth of liberal thought and independent thinkers. The same acute enthusiasm which makes his biography of Abelard at once a criticism and a panegyric, gives worth and warmth to what he says of Lardner and Arnold and Channing. He is wholly free from that mean bigotry which would neglect a great religious movement because it has not gained the force of numbers, or would despise the labors or writings of noble men because they bear a hated name. He will not treat the works of Unitarians, according to the fashion of many, as if they were the "productions of some successor of Martial or Petronius." The men who have advocated the Unitarian faith make it respectable in his view, even if it had no other support. "Since the voice of Channing has made itself heard from the other side of the Atlantic, disdain of a doctrine which inspires such defenders is simply ridiculous. A preacher like Channing, and a writer like Emerson, commend all that their genius has touched."

The general remarks upon the essence of religion and the nature of infallibility, with which M. Remusat

prefaces his essay, are quite different from those of the Romanist Balmes or the Calvinist Gausseen. He holds neither the infallibility of a man nor of a creed, nor, in its strict sense, of the collective Church. The Church is the best teacher of truth that exists, containing as it does the most of wisdom, faith, and supernatural aid, but at no time is it able to teach the whole of truth, the perfect truth. Even the best religion must be touched with human infirmity and affected by the error of natural reason. The logical conclusion that infallibility, so far as it exists, resides in the Pope, he does not quite admit, observing shrewdly, that "consistency is not the constant sign of truth." The student of the logical sophisms of the Schoolmen and the Sorbonne has read too much to believe that the sorcery of syllogisms is the sure voice of inspiration.

It is refreshing, too, to find a writer who is so ready in the service of the Church willing to admit that external unity is not the best mark of living truth; to allow that there may be good, pious, and Christian hearts even where there is wide departure from the standards of faith. M. Remusat does not regard the divisions of Protestantism as the proof of its weakness and error, or hold up, like the Bishop of Meaux, the varying creeds of dissent in evidence against the sects which have forsaken the Lord's house. These are to him rather the signs of spiritual activity, and he does not seem afraid even of a tendency to rationalism. The proper empire of Christianity is spiritual, not formal. Spiritual things are the synonymous term for religious things and Christian things. The effort of all schools of Christianity is to create in us the spiritual man. M. Remusat is not willing to judge sects by their tendencies, to approve those that would approach Catholicism or condemn those that approach simple philosophy. All seekers after religious truth, all lovers of religious truth, are in the way of faith, entitled to respect, and, so far as they claim the name, entitled to the Christian name. The sects shade off from the extreme orthodoxy of the Roman Church so gently, that it is impossible to separate them. Even in Catholic unity there are wide divergencies. A French priest does not believe all that a Spanish priest believes. M. Frayssinous (to

whose able manual of dogmas we hope hereafter to call attention) has not signed all that St. Thomas Aquinas has written. Father Gratry does not subscribe to all that Massillon preached. "Our churches," says M. Remusat, "are full of schismatic members." "Christianity and Orthodoxy are two very different ideas." "It is impossible not to regard Clarke and Channing as Christians."

Such principles and admissions in the beginning of the essay on Unitarianism prepare us for the enlightened views of the historical sketch which follows. The dogma of the Deity of Christ, according to this writer, has been from the very first a disputed doctrine. "It must be admitted," says he, "that, without the tradition and decisions of the Church, the text of the New Testament would not establish by incontestable proof the fundamental dogma of the Trinity." It may be politic in a Catholic to make this admission, sustaining, as it seems to sustain, the favorite development theory of modern Catholic philosophy; but it is made by one who deals with the progress of the doctrine in subsequent ages with severe impartiality. He allows to the Unitarians all that they claim,—that their doctrine has always been held in secret, that it has had learning, talent, virtue, and devotion on its side, has numbered great scholars as well as genuine martyrs, and has had more or less of influence and sympathy even where it has not been openly professed. He has preferred to trust for his information to Unitarian authorities, rather than to the misrepresentations of their enemies.

On the epoch of toleration which followed the downfall of the Stuarts, the remarks of M. Remusat are sagacious. The natural consequence of freedom of thought is a free interpretation of written creeds. Emancipated intelligence may easily explain the *persons* of the Trinity into divine *attributes*, and avoid by vagueness of language the logical difficulty of the holy mysteries. The chief objection to the Unitarians in that age was their tendency to schism. They were esteemed and upheld so long as they made no attempt to establish a sect. Their sin was that they would make a religion of their own. An Arian might hold the see of Canterbury or Salisbury, but could not es-

tablish unmolested a dissenting chapel at Cheltenham. External conformity could secure the largest intellectual liberty. Burnet lost no caste by his heretical notions. Tillotson was not the less an ornament to the Establishment that he was more than suspected of holding what the ancient councils condemned. Newton's "expressive silence" on the subject of the Trinity did not weaken his renown. The Unitarians were attacked, confuted, sometimes denounced with bitter vituperation, but their influence was scarcely diminished. Controversy did not injure them until they became separatists. And "always," remarks M. Remusat, "even in these latter days, Unitarianism, as a special and established religion, has met with far more obstacles and aroused far more opposition than Unitarianism as a philosophic opinion, or as an individual method of understanding religion in general. To be almost master of all our thoughts, we have only to show no wish of separation. *Every church prefers the unbelievers who remain within its pale even to the believers who abandon it.*"

In his views of the nature and spirit of the English Church, M. Remusat is singularly in accordance with Mr. Emerson. The superior value set upon conformity and profession, the need of respecting what society respects, and what belongs to the traditions of national glory, the identification of patriotism with piety in this convenient institution, the fact that the religion of the English Church is the religion of a gentleman, seem to him at once to guarantee the permanent existence of that church, while they nullify its pretension to uniformity or soundness of faith. If it had not been for the sects of dissenters who became the champions of more rigid orthodoxy, Unitarianism as an organized sect might never have existed in England. It was the protest against the bigotry of dissent, more than the errors of the Establishment. It was the assertion of honest confession against insincere or indifferent conformity on one hand, and against the corruptions of the Gospel on the other. It was, in the eighteenth century, an attempt to organize a religion of reason, as distinguished from a religion of manners and a religion of unquestioning faith in the creeds. The Unitarian movement

of that age is, in the opinion of M. Remusat, by no means to be confounded with the deism or scepticism which were then so ably defended. Lardner and Clarke are not to be classed with Voltaire and Hume, more than Locke is to be classed with Bolingbroke. "To describe what England thought in the last century, in the matter of religion, we must carefully distinguish three things;—the positive forms of faith, more or less strict, which characterized either the Established Church or the principal recognized sects, as it were so many different orthodoxies, if we may join these two words; Christian philosophy, which everywhere, even in the Church, begets individual doctrine, or, so to speak, lawful heresies, which are not always openly declared, but are allowed to make themselves manifest; and lastly, bare philosophy, isolated from all revelation, sometimes, like that of Hume, hostile to Christianity, sometimes, like that of Reid, respectful to faith and sincerely determined not to separate itself from this."

The effects of the Methodist movement of Whitefield and Wesley, and of the controversies excited by the French Revolution, upon the growth and development of the Unitarian body; the influence of Price and Priestley and William Smith; the changes in legislation, by which persecution became softened into recognition, and the Unitarians were allowed to take their proper place as religious reformers; the spirit of the recent Tractarian revival in the Church, with its counterpart of an awakened rationalism; the new schools of religious and philosophic science,—pass by like a series of dissolving views in M. Remusat's rapid and brilliant sketch. Perhaps the description of the English Church has borrowed rather too implicitly the fanciful classification of Mr. Conybeare, in his article on the High, Low, and Broad Churches in the Edinburgh Review, and we may think that the influence of Priestley is not brought into sufficiently bold relief; but on the whole, the account is correct and satisfactory. The English laws against blasphemy, which in the last century pressed so heavily upon liberal Christians, this writer characterizes as "*Draconian*." "What I have called Arianism," says he, "presents to us in England the freest expression of a liberty of thought still Christian." He attributes to

the proud contempt which Edmund Burke fastened upon the pretensions and the ideas of the Unitarians, the unjust disregard into which they seemed to fall. Unitarianism, he thinks, has a title to attention not only by its history, not only by its actual numbers as a sect,—three hundred congregations in the United Kingdom alone,—not only by the names of the great men who have avowed it,—men eminent in every walk of literature and science, among whom he is not afraid to include John Milton,—but also “as a symptom, a manifestation, of an interior state of mind, and of an intellectual work which goes on with more or less intensity in the bosom of most Protestant communions.” This intellectual excitement may not always take the form of sectarian dissent, or the style of literal heresy. But it makes the standard of saving orthodoxy very uncertain, and breaks up continually that comfortable conservatism which would rest in the opinions of famous doctors, and offer these as the substance of truth, as a Catholic rests in the decisions of the Councils, and has the views of St. Bernard and St. Thomas for his justification.

To illustrate this point is the object of M. Remusat's second essay, in which he takes up the interior dogmatic history of the English Church, dwelling especially upon the influence of Coleridge and Arnold. Here he does not hesitate to follow as trustworthy the work of Mr. John James Tayler, and though he does not spare reproach for the Unitarians at their willingness to join the names of Strauss and Feuerbach and Auguste Comte to the names of Milton and Clarke in the catalogue of their authors, he shows how wide is the range of faith, no faith, and false faith which the broad ægis of the Church of England covers,—“in the matter of systems, a genuine contraband of war.” If it does not protect all religious theories, it at least tolerates all, even to the discussion of the very being of God. Atheism has its propaganda with which the State Church does not venture to deal severely. In London, a minister and a secularist (which is only another name for atheist) hold a public debate, “whether there is any sufficient proof that there is a God distinct from Nature.” The arguments are calm, acute, and are printed to be read by thousands where only hundreds could hear them. The

same kind of debate is repeated at Glasgow in the presence of three thousand persons, in the City Hall, with the Provost of the city as president of the sessions.

The studies of M. Remusat have well fitted him to judge the position and influence of Coleridge upon the thought and philosophy of the English Church. It is somewhat curious, however, to find the name of Whately mentioned as one of the chiefs of the mystical orthodoxy which makes the essence of the new teaching of Coleridge. The view is correct, if Coleridge be taken as the advocate of the free application of reason to the understanding of dogmas and the interpretation of Scripture. By no contrivance can the mystical Trinity of the philosopher of Highgate be made to fit into the moulds of the Athanasian or Nicene Creeds. "If the Church and the Scriptures have the truth, it is because their dogmas answer to the needs and to the light of the speculative reason." The Coleridgian idea of the atonement and the mediation of Christ is certainly not that which any great assembly of the Church, Roman or English, have pronounced to be sound and revealed. It is not the doctrine of Augustine or of Calvin, or of the Thirty-nine Articles. While Coleridge avows his sympathy with the idea of the God made man, and airs his vocabulary of abuse of the liberal opinions which once he preached,—while he is bitter against all rationalists in religion from Grotius downward, and very respectful to the settled faith of the English Church,—he teaches and argues what, judged by itself, is a new view of religion, both in its form and its substance.

The most distinguished of Coleridge's successors among the champions of Christian freedom within the Established Church is that remarkable thinker and teacher whom M. Remusat almost *introduces* to French readers, so little is his name known beyond his own country. Into his sketch of the life and spirit of Dr. Arnold he has put all the warmth of thorough sympathy and admiration. His praise of this "sincere Christian" knows no bound. He could not have written more enthusiastically about a saint or a sage, about

Basil or Borromeo, than he has about this genuine believer, "whose religion was at once the rule and the soul of his life." It is delightful to see the honor which a Catholic pays, not only to one who, in the language of Archdeacon Hare, was an "*idoloclast*," but even because he was an *idoloclast*, *because* he hated useless forms, idols and shams of every kind,—the honor which the cautious philosophic scholar pays to the best type of the Christian reformer. The natural abilities of Arnold are not exaggerated; there is no pretence that he was very great in intellect, or very learned, and it is admitted that he left no literary work equal to his fame; yet the Frenchman declares that it will be difficult to "find his equal in Christendom" for earnestness of faith, and for a broad and generous conception of the scope and purpose of Christ's Church. Arnold's idea, he says, was, that creeds have value, but not the highest value; that theology does not make men Christians; that *Christian society*, and not special corporations which take Christ's name, is the true Church of Christ. Preaching, teaching, and the sacraments are all good in their way, but an exclusive priesthood, an aristocracy of religion, has neither divine nor apostolic sanction. Christianity is not a dead science, not an archaeology, but is a progressive system, which adapts itself to the needs of every age, and ought continually to follow the course of God's providence in the world.

We regret that we can do no more in this short notice than give the closing passages of M. Remusat's sketch of Dr. Arnold. These, however, are enough to show fairly the style and the soul of the writer.

"It has been rightly said, that Arnold resembled a man of antiquity converted to Christianity. Greek and Roman history had penetrated his spirit; he loved not only their noble writings, but their fine examples. He contrasted gladly the grand virtue in the ancient societies with all that seemed vile in this modern time; yet, however strange such a sentiment may seem to prejudiced Calvinists, he was none the less a Protestant full of fervor. Doubtless he preferred piety to orthodoxy. The words of the creeds were not to him sacred as truth, of which they were but an imperfect expression. The rights of the moral conscience, the spirit of Christ's teaching, ought,

according to him, to prevail against the letter of the text or the traditional commentary. He held pious fraud to be sacrilege, and regarded absolute sincerity to be duty. Happy he to whom life's experience has left unshaken this perfect faith in truth alone!"

"It is in his six volumes of sermons that we learn best how Arnold united this liberty of soul, which comes from entire sincerity, with this spiritual fervor which supports itself on the energy of moral feeling. We cannot share all his convictions, yet it is difficult not to be touched by them, since there is between these convictions and ourselves no barrier of a servile attachment to the formulas of an official tradition, to the commands of a corporation which calls itself sacred. Arnold finds in Scripture the witnesses of the life of Christ, and learns from these to know him and to love him. Thanks to the historical sense with which he was gifted, he discovers in some sort the person of Christ in the monuments left by his disciples, and by those who were hearers of these, and makes himself, so to speak, present with them, so that he seems to be living beneath the eye of the Divine Master. To flee from evil and to fight with it, to love good and to do good, this is to love God, to please God, and to come near to him continually, in spite of the infinite distance which separates man from God. We can understand how this burning, moral, practical faith has nothing incompatible with the free use of reason in the interpretation of the Scriptures. It sanctifies this liberty with all the rest, and it is all the stronger against the attacks of the unbelieving spirit, that it asks no sacrifice of the sentiment of human dignity. *I dare to say, if there have appeared in our time writings useful to the cause of Christianity, they are the writings of Arnold.*"

These are bold words for a Catholic to utter, but they are the words of a lover of truth, and we are confident that they will be ably and fearlessly illustrated in the future essays in which M. Remusat proposes to present more at length the *three classes of liberal Christians*;—those who, whether in the Episcopal or the Dissenting churches, are Unitarians in fact without adopting the name; those who are not afraid to bear this name, and yet are sincere Christians in their feeling; and those

who are free thinkers without attachment to the Gospel, yet holding to the form of religion from an unwillingness to seem out of the pale of the Church. "In the number of these," he says, "there will be offered more than one portrait to draw, more than one remarkable work to make known; and although this triple school has not perhaps been as fruitful in England as in America, it will be seen that the Clarkes and the Lardners, the Prices and the Priestleys, have not been left without successors."

The excellent maxim which M. Remusat adopts as the rule of his judgments is, "Let us not fear to treat as Christians all those who sincerely wish to be so." Can there be any better rule?

C. H. B.

ART. VI.—QUEVEDO'S ROME, IN RUINS.

A ROMA, SEPULTADA EN SUS RUINAS.

POR DON FRANCISCO DE QUEVEDO.

BUSCAS en Roma á Roma, O peregrino !
Y en Roma misma á Roma no la hallas :
Cadaver son, las que ostentó murallas,
Y tumba de si propio el Aventino.

Yace donde reynaba el Palatino,
Y limadas del tiempo las medallas,
Mas se muestran destrozo á las batallas
De las edades, que blazon latino.

Solo el Tibre quedó, cuya corriente
Si ciudad la regó, ya sepultura
La llora, con funesto son doliente.

O Roma ! en tu grandeza, en tu hermosura
Huyó lo que era firme, y solamente
Lo fugitivo permanece y dura.

TO ROME, BURIED IN HER RUINS.

STRANGER ! thou vainly seek'st for Rome in Rome ;
But Rome, in Rome herself, thou wilt not find :
Her walls are dust, the sport of every wind ;
The Aventine is buried in its tomb.

Where rose the Palatine, she lies in gloom ;
Her medals, with time's traces overlined,
Tell more of strife of ages left behind,
Than blazonry triumphant in its bloom.

The Tiber but remains ; whose ancient wave,
Where once it washed a city, weeps a grave,
And mourns the glories no one now can trace.

O Rome ! of thy vast greatness and thy grace,
All that was *firm* has fled ; and only now
Endures, the fleeting, passing river-flow.

ART. VII.—BUCHANAN AND HITCHCOCK ON RELIGION
AND SCIENCE.*

ONE need not be a prophet or the son of a prophet to predict that the quarrel between Religion and Science will eventually be pronounced a very idle one. As in other cases, so in this, we shall be amazed to find how few words of explanation will set all right, and how strangely we have been confounding all along essentials with non-essentials, truths with the forms of truths, and the grand conclusions of faith with the means of illus-

* 1. *Modern Atheism under its Forms of Pantheism, Materialism, Secularism, Development, and Natural Laws.* By JAMES BUCHANAN, D. D., LL. D., Divinity Professor in the New College, Edinburgh, etc. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. 1857. 12mo. pp. 423.

2. *Religious Truth, illustrated from Science, in Addresses and Sermons on Special Occasions.* By EDWARD HITCHCOCK, D. D., LL. D., Late President of Amherst College, and now Professor of Natural Theology and Geology. Boston: Phillips, Sampson, and Company. 1857. 12mo. pp. 422.

3. *The Religion of Geology and its Connected Sciences.* By EDWARD HITCHCOCK, D. D., LL. D. Eleventh Thousand. Boston: Phillips, Sampson, and Company. 1856. 12mo. pp. 511.

tration and defence that human zeal, always honest, but not always well instructed, has multiplied about them. It requires no great insight to see that all the revelations of God must be in harmony, and that all discrepancies between the various witnesses for the Eternal One must be superficial, not radical. Does any one in his senses, any man of healthy mind, suppose for a moment that Religion is to be given up,—that the world is to believe and pray no longer? Does any man of average intelligence deliberately hold that Science is to be given up,—that its unmistakable results are to be treated as nullities? Will not the heart of man for ever cry out for God, even the living God, who heareth and answereth prayer? Can we fail to discern the image of the Father in the Son? Will not the primal duties for ever “shine aloft like stars”? Must we hold these treasures of Religion in defiance of the claims of Science, refusing to admit its plainest lessons, insisting, if need be, that two and two do not make four, or resorting to a form of special pleading the honesty of which can scarcely be defended? Every man in his best and most rational hours will at once reply to these questions, that Religion and Science must both be sustained and pursued with all earnestness, that we ought to look for progress in both these grand departments of human life, and that the subject of their mutual relation should be discussed with the utmost confidence. Nothing can be said in the way of a statement of difficulties, provided only that the words come from a well-meaning person, which one need fear to hear or seek to repress. On the contrary, the freest discussion and the fullest recognition of every perplexity must in the end bring to light marvellous harmonies and correspondences between the things which occupy the mind and the senses, and the deeper mysteries of the conscience and the heart.

Now all this is easy to write, but where, it is asked, is your proof, and where are your facts? Are they not wanting, or good for quite opposite conclusions? What is this but sheer assertion? How can any one hazard so much in the face of the dread which religionists express of Science, the positive hatred which many of them appear to feel towards it, or in view of the sneers, or quiet contempt, or more respectful scepticism, of not a few scientific

men when they are brought into contact with religion ? We reply, that what we have asserted is but the utterance of simple common sense, what one might go before the world with, sure of gaining at least assent, and of incurring no charge save that of venting commonplaces. Men must believe, and men must think. They must have a religion, and just in proportion as they think about other subjects they must think about this. They will be without hope when they are without God and Christ, but nevertheless they will study Geology, Chemistry, Physics, and Metaphysics, and not fear that they shall turn up anything in the earth, or trace out anything in the laboratory, that telescope or microscope will bring on to the stage either nebula or animalecule, which shall have power to take away the ground of their confidence. We say this is but common sense. It does not profess to amount to an expression of faith. We could not disclaim arrogant assumption were we to assert that Religion must turn Science out of doors, or that Science must sooner or later put upon Religion the brand of superstition. This would be dogmatism, bigotry of the most offensive sort, no matter from which side it should come, whether from a narrow and over-literal church on the one hand, or from the halls of a flippant and conceited intellectualism on the other.

Now if the case is so plain, save to the bigoted pietist or the equally bigoted naturalist, of what use are the books the titles of which we have given ? We answer, that there are times when the commonest truths are under a cloud, when even those who are firmly persuaded of them do not clearly see how they are to be made out, when the old and customary defences and illustrations have ceased to be available, when we must give some added diligence to draw a fresh line between essentials and non-essentials. Besides, plain things are liable to be lost sight of, and they must be placed anew before human eyes. We may mistake the widest road. Moreover, the time may never come when bigotry will not need to be set right, or a shallow scepticism fail to require enlargement. And yet again there is nothing in which the deficiency of the general culture is more apparent, than in the failure to distinguish between truths and the vehicles in which they are providentially con-

veyed to the mind ; in other words, between the spirit and the letter, or yet again between the revelation and the record of it. In this respect the Church has indeed made some progress since the days of Galileo, but even tolerably well-instructed Christians have still much to learn in this way, and the only marvel is that the record meets so well the extravagant claims which, in their earnest and just regard for the revelation itself, they have been led to set up for it. Such persons impose a very hard task upon the religious men of science, and they have taken it up manfully and wrought wonders in the way of exegesis, and have played advocate less than could have been expected in the circumstances. Moreover, the works of these mediators between knowledge and faith, besides serving their direct and intended purpose, have often supplied admirable illustrations of religious lessons, and made important additions to the stock of popular science. For the reasons that have been suggested, as well as for the permanent interest in physical and metaphysical investigations, the books which have been named above, and many others of the same stamp, have secured and will secure many readers ; and although these readers may not all be satisfied with the results reached or the methods by which they have been reached, they will find a reward for all the time and attention that may have been exacted by the perusal.

We believe that we shall be rendering a good service to our readers by bringing distinctly to their notice some of the writers at home and abroad who have made it their special business to carry science into religion and religion into science, and this too in the light of this present life, and amidst the perplexities and questionings of the world we are laboring in to-day ; not battling with old dead giants, galvanized into a sort of resurrection for the strife, but grappling with foes who but lately have been born into the world, and whom no man has yet conquered.

First comes the successor of Dr. Chalmers in Edinburgh New College, the Rev. Dr. Buchanan, discussing Modern Atheism, with its theories of development, cosmical (represented by "The Vestiges"), physiological, social, and ecclesiastical, its pantheism, material and ideal, its materialism, its theory of government by natu-

ral laws, of chance and fate, of religious liberalism, of certitude and scepticism, its questionings of the efficacy of prayer, and its plea for worldliness under the name of secularism. Dr. Buchanan marches bravely up to his subject, and grapples with it in all good faith. His business is really with the atheism of our times, which indeed is only the atheism of all times, the same dreary doubts or denials reproduced in new phraseology; and he is very successful in showing the weakness both of the physics and of the metaphysics of the unbeliever. The spirit of the book is kindly and candid, the argument honest, the conclusions sound. It fills an important place, and will be of great service to many perplexed minds. Thus much we can honestly write, but we are constrained to add that the book as a whole does not quite satisfy us. It does not answer the expectation which the announcement of it had awakened. Perhaps the larger work, of which this is only a part, would fill up what is behind. Perhaps it is impossible that any argument upon religion should be wholly satisfactory. Logic avails more to break the force of denials and objections brought against the theist, than to establish positive conclusions on the side of faith; and so when we are done with it, we are rather glad and relieved that we have not been defeated, than exultant in the utter discomfiture of the enemy and the triumphant establishment of our own side. In this matter logic is rather critical than constructive. We think that few preachers of any experience ever devote sermons to proving the existence of God. Suppose they should be unhappy in their statement of the various arguments, suppose the proof as put by them should be defective, should we not feel that the congregation would be guilty of a practical *non sequitur*, worse than any false logic of the preacher, were they to go away and say, "There is no God any more"? How many believe in God as they believe that they themselves live, and yet could give you no good arguments for their faith. They did not arrive at their belief by any process of reasoning. The logic of the theist is better than the logic of the atheist, and the weapons upon which the unbeliever relies may be profitably turned against him; but when the noise of the battle is over, the contending parties are found where

they were when the strife began, the one it may be a little crestfallen and less vociferous than before, yet still dissatisfied and muttering. We cannot escape the impression, that, although this book by Dr. Buchanan is far beyond the average of such productions, it would have been very much better if the author had realized more fully than he seems to have done the difficulties of the search after God, and, abandoning not so much the purpose as the tone of antagonism, had endeavored to learn what the atheists, real or seeming, fail to find in the positions of the believer,—why it is that any man as honest and as sensible as the average ever takes up with atheism, or pantheism, or materialism, as the best attainable solution of the riddle of life. The surest way to kill any error is to admit the truth which it contains. So doing, we take the life out of it, and make it powerless from that day forward. For example, we can do nothing with the pantheist unless we are willing to confess that God is in the world, that in him we all live, move, and have our being, that he is the life of all that lives, that he creates all things out of his own fulness and worketh hitherto in the least and in the greatest; all this may and must be confessed, and yet it is none the less true that God exists in perfection apart from his world, and is a true Creator and real Father. So again Holyoake, the secularist, with all his crudities and perversities, is not utterly at fault; perhaps he is no more to blame than those who, by their formal, superficial, and dogmatic treatment of religion, have encouraged the fancy that godliness has no concern with this life. His movement is a clumsy protest against a postponement of the kingdom of God to the next world. So earnest a man must come right, it would seem, in the long run. Dr. Buchanan has not, we think, dealt with error so much after this fashion as he might have done, and for this reason he will have the fewer converts amongst those whom he would really wish to influence,—those who need to be converted. They will feel that he does not always appreciate them. We by no means affirm that the whole book is open to this criticism, but the objection will be found to hold to a considerable extent.

But if the author of "Modern Atheism" has been somewhat unsuccessful in the direction which has just

been indicated, he has been very happy in his attempt to show that some of the positions of modern science which have been regarded by the friends of religion with the most dread, are really matters of indifference ; and though they should be made good, as they have not yet been, would not threaten either the foundations or the superstructure of the household of faith. Take, for example, the following passage with reference to the theory of development by natural laws :—

“ Now, as this method is followed in the work of Providence, which may be, and often has been, described as a *continuous creation*, and yet has no tendency to destroy, or even to diminish, the evidence of a presiding Intelligence in Nature, so no good reason can be assigned why it *might* not also have been adopted in the production of planets and astral systems, if so it had seemed good to Supreme Wisdom. If this method was adopted for the propagation of plants and animals, no reason can be given why it might not also have been adopted for the production of planets and moons ; nor would it in the latter case, any more than in the former, impair the evidence of God’s creative wisdom and power. For suppose it be possible that, by a marvellous process of self-evolution, the material elements of Nature might assume new forms, so as to originate a succession of new worlds and new planetary systems, without the *immediate* or *direct* interposition of a Supernatural Will ; suppose that the earth, and the other bodies now belonging to our own system, were generated out of a prior condition of matter, existing in a gasiform state and diffused through space as a Fire-Mist, subject to the ordinary action of heat and gravitation ; suppose, in short, that there were LAWS FOR THE GENERATION OF WORLDS in the larger cycles of time, just as there ARE LAWS FOR THE GENERATION OF ANIMALS in the short ages of terrestrial life ; — would a provision for such a succession of marvellous developments necessarily destroy, or even impair, the evidence for the being and perfections of God ? Does the generation of the animated tribes diminish the evidence of design in the actual constitution of the world ? And why should a similar provision, if any such were found to exist, for the generation of stars and systems, be regarded in any other light than as an exhibition, on a still larger scale, of ‘ the manifold wisdom of God ’ ?

“ Let it ever be remembered that the Theistic argument depends, not on *the mode of production*, but on *the character of the resulting product*. The world may have been produced mediately or immediately, with or without the operation of natural laws ; but if it exhibit such an arrangement of parts,

such an adaptation of means to ends, or such a combination of collocations and adjustments, as enables us at once to discern the distinctive marks of intelligent design, the evidence cannot be diminished, it may even be possibly enhanced, by the method of production. Provision is made, doubtless, for the growth and development of the eye, the ear, and the hand, in the human foetus, and the process by which they are gradually formed is regulated by natural laws. But the resulting products are so exquisitely constructed, so admirably adapted to the elements of nature, and so evidently designed for the uses of life, that they irresistibly suggest the idea of wise and benevolent contrivances ; and this idea is as strong and clear as it could have been had they been produced instantaneously by the *direct* act of creative power. And so of the planets and astral systems : they may have been generated, that is, produced, in a way of natural development ; yet the resulting products are such as to evince the supreme wisdom and beneficence which presided over their formation. But even this is not all. Let us suppose, further, that Philosophy may yet reach its extreme, and, as we humbly conceive, unattainable limit ; let us suppose that it may succeed in decomposing all the chemical elements now known, by resolving them into ONE primary basis ; let us even suppose that it may succeed in reducing all the subordinate laws of Nature into ONE supreme and universal law ; still the development of such a system as we see around us out of such materials, and by such means, would not be necessarily exclusive of the idea of God, but might afford evidence of a Supreme Mind, creating, combining, and controlling all things for the manifestation of His adorable perfections." — pp. 57-59.

It should be added, as Dr. Buchanan is careful to state, that the author of "The Vestiges" disclaims all atheistic conclusions which may possibly be deduced from his theories.

Professor Hitchcock, as our readers well know, has devoted himself to natural science, especially to geology, and the direction of his studies appears in both of the books the titles of which we have given. The more recent of the two is a collection of lectures, sermons, and addresses delivered on different occasions within a very few of the years which, whether as President or Professor, the author has filled full of useful work. Three of them hardly fall within the general title of the book, but they are well worth preserving anywhere, and it is certainly very honorable to a gentleman so fully occupied

with his own immediate duties, and withal in such delicate health, that he could find or make time and strength to labor in so many quarters as a preacher and teacher. Let this book silently witness for his diligence and zeal. The writer's own account of the growth of his work is characteristic, and worth quoting:—

“The quarryman, who has made excavations in the rocks for architectural materials, sometimes looks over the fragments which have been thrown aside, and finds blocks that seem to him worth preserving. Thus have I been doing with the literary *débris*, which has been quarried and wrought on special occasions, and afterwards thrown aside. With some new dressing, I have ventured to hope that a part of them are worth preserving, and this volume is the result.”—p. 3.

The opening paper is the author's Inaugural Address upon the occasion of entering upon the Presidency of Amherst College. Somewhat stiff and over-homiletic in style, it is full of sound and interesting material, and is marked throughout by the utmost candor and an excellent moderation. Take, for example, this sensible treatment of two vexed matters:—

“There are two recent offsets from physiology, which have been supposed fraught with influences unfavorable to religion. I refer to phrenology and mesmerism. The first has been thought to favor materialism, and to lessen human responsibility; and the latter, to bring miracles into disrepute, and to direct us, for the cure of the body and the soul, to a class of dreaming pretenders, whose responses are about as much to be relied on as those of the oracle of Delphos, the god of Ekron, or the witch of Endor, and whom it is about as impious to consult. The merits of these new branches of science, this is not the proper occasion to discuss; nor is it easy as yet to ascertain definitely what principles in them are settled. But admitting their pretensions, the first seems to leave the question of materialism just where it found it; since it is as easy to see how an immaterial soul should act through a hundred organs as through one. Nor does it seem to me more difficult, on natural principles, to see how the mind may act at a distance, through the undulations of a mesmeric medium, than to see how light and heat are transmitted by the waves of a luminiferous ether. On the other hand, if physiology and phrenology tend to materialism, certainly mesmerism tends even more decidedly to immaterialism; as the conversion of several distinguished materialists will testify. It does, also, open to the Christian (admitting its state-

ments to be true) most interesting glimpses of the mode in which the mind may act when freed from flesh and blood, and clothed with a spiritual body. Indeed, I doubt not that, in regard both to phrenology and mesmerism, the general principle will prove true, that, the more ominous of evil any branch of knowledge seems to be in its incipient state, the more prolific it will ultimately become in illustrations favorable both to morality and religion." — pp. 39, 40.

Or read this important testimony with reference to another subject of great interest : —

" The existence of animals too minute to be seen by the naked eye has, indeed, long been known ; but it was not till the researches of Ehrenberg that any just conceptions of their infinite number and indefinite minuteness were entertained. We now know that nine millions of some of these animalcula may live in a space not larger than a mustard-seed, and that their numbers are many million times greater than that of all other animals on the globe. Indeed, the microscope has laid open a field into the infinitesimal forms of organic and inorganic nature quite as boundless, both in number and extent, as the telescope discloses in infinite space. Nor can we find any limits in the one direction more than the other ; and thus does the microscope, in the same manner as the telescope, prodigiously enlarge our conceptions of the perfections of the infinite Author of the universe.

" These researches have cast not a little light upon a certain hypothesis, that has been, in one form or another, often thrown before the world since the days of Democritus and Epicurus, usually for the purpose of sustaining a system of atheism. It supposes an inherent power in nature, capable of producing plants and animals without parentage, by an imagined vital force, essential to some forms of matter. The ancient philosophers imputed these effects to a ' fortuitous concourse of atoms.' In modern times this general statement has been made more definite by Lamarck, Geoffroy St. Hilaire, Bory St. Vincent, and others, who suppose that Nature — in their vocabulary sometimes dignified by the title of Deity, but still unintelligent, and merely instrumental — gives origin only to ' monads,' or ' rough draughts' of organic beings ; and that these, by ' an inherent tendency to improvement,' and ' the force of external circumstances,' become animals of higher and higher organization ; until at last the orang-outang abandoned his quadrupedal condition, and stood erect as man, with all his lofty powers of intellect. Before the invention of the microscope, a multitude of insects and worms were thought to have this equivocal origin, and to pass through these transmutations, — an example of which

every Latin scholar will recollect in the directions of Virgil for the production of a swarm of bees out of the carcass of an animal. But as optical instruments have been improved, and observations have become more acute, the origin of nearly every animal visible to the naked eye has been found to be by ordinary generation. The advocates of the spontaneous production of organic beings, however, still clung to the animalcula and the entozoa. But it is now clearly demonstrated that all the former class have been derived from parents ; and that more abundant means are provided for their reproduction than for any of the higher tribes of animals. The same is true of the entozoa, — a single individual of which is capable of producing more than sixty millions of progeny ; and it would be very strange for nature to take such extraordinary pains for their propagation if it might have been accomplished spontaneously." — pp. 40 - 42.

Or yet again follow the writer through these brave words, taken from the Lecture on the Relations between the Philosopher and the Theologian : —

" Finally, it ought to be a position admitted by the philosopher and the theologian, that the facts and principles of science, brought before an unsophisticated mind, are favorable to piety. A contrary impression prevails extensively ; just because not a few scientific men, in spite of science, and not through its influence, have been sceptics. Their hearts were wrong when they began the study ; and then, according to a general law of human nature, the purest truth became only a means of increasing their perversity. But had their hearts been right at first, that same truth would have nourished and strengthened their faith and love. Why should it not be so ? For what is true science but an exhibition of God's plans and operations ? And will any one maintain that a survey of what God has planned and is executing should have an unfavorable moral effect upon an unperverted and unprejudiced mind ? If it does, it must be through the influence of extraneous causes, such as pride, prejudice, bad education, or bad habits, for which science is not accountable. O no ! the temple of Nature is a holy place for a holy heart. Pure fire is always burning upon its altar, and its harmonies are ever hymning the praises of its great Architect, inviting all who enter to join the chorus. It needs a perverse and hardened heart to resist the good influences that emanate from its shrines." — pp. 71, 72.

Copious as our extracts have already been, we must add to them the following creed of the theologian and philosopher, taken from the same Lecture : —

"They should start with the principle that theology is entitled to higher respect, as a standard of appeal, than any branch of knowledge not strictly demonstrative.

"It should also be admitted, that, as a means of moral reformation and a regulator of human affairs, philosophy has little comparative power.

"They can agree, also, in the position, that entire harmony will be the final result of all researches in philosophy and religion.

"To the scientific man should be granted the freest and the fullest liberty of investigation.

"The language of science and of Scripture, as well as of popular religious literature, requires different, or at least modified, principles of interpretation.

"Revelation has not anticipated scientific discovery.

"It is required that those who pronounce judgment on points of connection between science and revelation, should be well acquainted with both subjects.

"The facts and principles of science, to an unprejudiced, unsophisticated mind, are favorable to piety.

"They form a vast storehouse for the use of natural theology.

"They cast light upon and illustrate revelation.

"The harmony of science and revelation is mutually beneficial.

"The cultivation of science, without the restraints of religion, often proves very disastrous.

"The general diffusion of science through a community is impossible without religion.

"The precise language of science may be useful in stating the principles of theology.

"History shows impressively the danger of exalting philosophy above revelation.

"And the evils of substituting a denunciatory spirit for knowledge and argument.

"It shows us also the evils of mutual jealousy and hard speeches between theologians and philosophers.

"And the folly and weakness of predicting injury to revelation from scientific discoveries.

"The more threatening to religion the developments of any science at first, the more abundant will be its defence and illustration of religion ultimately.

"Finally, it is unwise hastily to denounce any new discovery as unfriendly to religion, and much safer to wait till its nature and bearing are well understood." — pp. 93, 94.

The paper entitled "The Wonders of Science compared with the Wonders of Romance" has interested us

beyond the rest. It would be worth more to the pupils of our high schools than hundreds of dreary pages devoted to what is called Natural Philosophy. It is hard to select where all is so good, but perhaps the following passage is a fair specimen of the illustrations, which are so abundantly furnished in the Lecture, at once of the mystery and of the wisdom of Providence:—

“The vast variety which nature produces by the union of a few elements is one of the most wonderful results of chemical affinity. It is true chemists describe a little over sixty of these elements; but sixteen of these constitute almost the entire mass of the globe, and scarcely more than four are essential to form the vast variety of the animal and vegetable kingdoms. It is amazing, also, to see how very great a difference between two compounds is often produced by a slight variation in the proportion of their ingredients. Oxygen and nitrogen, for instance, mixed in the proportion of one of the former to four of the latter, constitute the atmosphere, the very *pabulum* of life to animals and plants. But combine them in the proportion of fourteen parts nitrogen and eight parts oxygen, and you form the exhilarating gas, little better adapted to respiration than the vapor of alcohol or ether. Add eight parts more of oxygen, and a gas results, which, taken into the lungs, would be almost certainly fatal. Add successively eight, sixteen, and twenty-four parts more of oxygen, and three distinct acids would be formed, eminently hostile to life. What perfect wisdom and perfect benevolence must have arranged the chemical constitution and agencies of this world, to adapt them to the delicate organization of animals and plants! And how very slightly the elements of life differ from the elements of death! The most delicious fruits of the vegetable kingdom, for instance, are composed of oxygen, hydrogen, and carbon, and sometimes nitrogen; and the most fatal vegetable poisons have the same composition, differing only in the proportion of the ingredients.” — p. 157.

“The Religion of Geology” is familiar to us in one of the earlier “thousands.” It is an exceedingly interesting, and, on the whole, very fair book. In common, however, with many publications of the class, it bears a needlessly heavy burden. “We ought only to expect,” says Dr. Hitchcock, “that the facts of science, rightly understood, should not contradict the statements of revelation, correctly interpreted.” * Now, we submit that

* Religion of Geology, p. 4.
40*

this is more than we ought to expect. The inspiration of the writers of the Bible was that of the preacher and prophet, not that of the man of science. When they speak of the creation of the world, or of the order of the universe, it is to enforce the doctrines of one divine Creator and of his constant providence, and to this end popular language is the best, even though it expresses scientific error. So far as natural science is concerned, they occupy the common level; only as seers and proclaimers of spiritual and moral truths are they lifted above us. This is true of them, whether they are reproducing ancient documents or publishing new oracles. The science is a secondary matter. In some cases they seem hardly to have thought about it at all, and by their own course plainly indicate that with them, for their special purpose, it was a thing of indifference. Why should we attempt to harmonize with science a writer who in respect to science has taken no pains to be at one with himself? Let any one, for example, turn to the sublime stories of creation in the first two chapters of Genesis. We say stories, for they seem to be two, and distinct, and, to say the least, not easily to be reconciled. According to the first account, lower animals were made before man; according to the second, after; according to one, fowls were produced from the water; according to the other, from the ground. In the first, the human sexes are described as created at once, whilst the second brings them on the stage successively. Which of these accounts shall we endeavor to reconcile with science? We answer, either or neither, it matters not. It was the religion in them that commended the stories to Moses, and makes them valuable to us. If we insist upon anything more, we misuse what is admirably fitted for practical instruction, by compelling it to furnish matter for contention between Scriptural and anti-Scriptural geologists, and impose upon the Christian apologist a special pleading, a narrowing of this statement and a widening of that, which is more ingenious than satisfactory, and leaves us when we have done with it only not defeated.

To take another instance, the story of the deluge presents considerable difficulty to one who demands of the Bible nothing at variance with absolute scientific accu-

racy. A curious difference of opinion as to the teachings of science in this matter has prevailed amongst scholars of equal pretensions, to say the least. On the one hand, some treat the flood in the days of Noah as universal, and attribute to that deluge changes in the surface of the earth which clearly point to the action of water; others, on the contrary, and Dr. Hitchcock is of the number, incline to limit the deluge, and refer the indications of the wear and waste of a flood to the last of the long eras marked by geology before the earth was inhabited by man. The former of these positions is seriously embarrassed by the fact, that, in the masses of fossil remains deposited during those commotions, not a single clear trace of human relics has as yet been detected,— animals in profusion, but no man,— clearly pointing, it would seem, to some crisis before what we call creation, that is, the arrangement of the earth in its present state as the habitation of man. Moreover, whilst in former days, when the animal creation was but little known, it was not difficult by an ingenious calculation to show that the ark might contain a large number of creatures besides the needful food, it is not so easy in these days to dispose of the myriads which science has brought into the light, the numberless varieties imbedded in ground and rocks that cannot upon any supposition be assigned to any later period than that of the deluge. Yet again, if it be true, as the best naturalists maintain, that the animal creation does not all ray out from a single centre, but is distributed in groups and families over the earth, with a proper head and centre for each group, the difficulty will be much increased; at all events, it is evident, that, in the present condition of things, the transmigration of the various tribes from their various proper localities would be impossible in accordance with any natural laws; the animals whose home is the tropics could not pass through the temperate to the cold regions of the earth, nor could the polar animals migrate the other way, without loss of life. On the whole, there is much that strongly induces one to limit the language in which the deluge is described. We can do this if we regard the spiritual and moral element as alone essential, if, having recognized the religious and ethical lesson as that which interested the writer of Genesis in the story, we

make no stand for his literal accuracy, whether in scientific or historic matters. How otherwise shall we dispose of the admission that a flood which would cover Ararat must necessarily submerge the whole earth? Professor Hitchcock attempts to avoid this difficulty by the suggestion, — made, as he asserts, before geology had put any hard questions, — that by the mountains of Ararat we are to understand some lower peak of the range. But this seems to us wholly irreconcilable with the narrative in its present state. "The ark rested in the seventh month, on the seventeenth day of the month, upon the mountains of Ararat." (Genesis viii. 4.) Not until the first day of the tenth month, or two months and a half after, "were the *tops* of the mountains *seen*." Now, if Ararat was not under water, it must have been seen all the while, even before the ark grounded. We are satisfied that Professor Hitchcock must go a little further than he does, even to satisfy his own articles of faith, scientific and religious.

And yet we ought rather to be thankful than to criticise. This able scholar and zealous Christian has done much to interpret the elder Scripture, to unfold the meaning of that book of God, to make the dullest feel that we live amidst miracles of divine power and goodness, and can only be profited by exploring, in all courage and trust, every field which science has opened, admitting, without any timid regard to the consequences, every well-established fact which the study of matter or of mind shall add to the scholar's material. It shall still stand fast, that by the word of God the heavens and the earth were made, that by the same word the prophets prophesy and the soul is redeemed, and that between the writings upon the stones and upon the parchments there can be no fatal discrepancy.

R. E.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Aurora Leigh. By ELIZABETH BARRETT BROWNING. New York : C. S. Francis & Co. 1857. 12mo. pp. 365, 366.

THE Germans speak of what they call the "Storm and Pressure" period of their literary history. English poetry is now passing through what may be styled its Strain and Stress period, of which Mr. Alexander Smith and Mrs. Browning are among the most remarkable representatives. "*Aurora Leigh*" has more wealth of phrase and fancy than any preceding work of its author. It contains some admirable descriptions. There are passages in it of great power and real charm. But the book, on the whole, with just as many full pages of blank verse as there are days in a year, we cannot but regard as a vehement extravagance. The style is "all a-shake" with passionate movements, not without a dash every now and then of the coarse and unseemly. The characters are such as could not exist, and the incidents such as could not take place.

The heroine, born in Florence of an English father of noble connections and an Italian mother who died when her child was but four years old, goes to England, after his death, to live with an ungracious aunt, who could not be reconciled to her foreign blood. She is poet, philosopher, scholar ; proud of her family descent, and conscious of her acquisitions, high spirit, and strength of mind. She is capable of being sharp with her tongue, if we may judge from many samples ; among others, her boasting of having always refused to "ink her lips" by drawing through them any friendly expressions towards a certain lady, whom she upbraids with "that poisonous porridge called her soul." An imperious and not very gentle or feminine person. She thinks of "speaking her poems"

"in mysterious tune
With man and nature ; — with the lava-lymph
That trickles from successive galaxies
Still drop by drop adown the finger of God."

She is deeply, though half unconsciously, in love with her cousin, Romney Leigh, whose hand she yet scornfully refuses, and whom she does not fail to tutor and snub till we come towards the end of the volume. Romney deserved, indeed, her refusal of him, by wounding her pride in his manner of addressing her. He is an aristocratic radical, a flaming philanthropist and socialist, a most unaccountable, yet represented as a most

admirable man. The rejected suitor, after a time, partly from affection and partly from his Quixotic fancies, proposes to take for his wife Marian Erle, a more wonderful person than himself, whose life he had helped to preserve. Born and brought up in the midst of the most filthy poverty and the most shocking crimes, and compelled at last to run away from her brutal parents, she is a paragon of purity and all excellence. Fleur de Marie was an every-day character by the side of her. Leigh is betrothed to her, and the marriage-day is appointed; the high-born gentleman preferring meanwhile to keep his bride in the disgusting and dangerous neighborhood where she had her abode. The church is now open for the nuptials. It is crowded on one side with lords and titled ladies, and on the other with swarms of loathsome and scarcely human creatures from St. Giles's and the worst sinks of London depravity: —

“ ‘T was as if you had stirred up hell
To heave its lowest dreg-fiends uppermost
In fiery swirls of slime.’ ”

All these wretches are there by invitation, in deference to the principles of human equality, and are to have a great feast, after the ceremony is over, on Hampstead Heath.

But the mixed multitude have come together for nothing. The bride does not appear. The meeting breaks up in a storm of disorder, and the hero escapes narrowly with his life from the hands of the furious rabble, who believe that the plebeian maiden has suffered some foul wrong from her pretended bridegroom. It seems that the beautiful Lady Waldemar had persuaded her that she could never make so glorious a creature as Romney happy, and confessed that she was in love with him herself. In brief, she has prevailed upon Marian, the very day before the wedding, to steal away, with no companion but a strange woman, who turns out to be a very monster of wickedness, and to fly off to unknown parts of the earth. Now this is really too much. Such a sublime simpleton as that was never heard of before; and such a scene as that was never enacted on any stage.

In the course of time, the poor girl is found by Aurora in one of the flower-markets of Paris, with a child in her arms of an unknown father, but she herself the same spotless and peerless creature as before. Her story is told, if it may be said to be told, in a great abundance of words, and with the usual intensity and shadow. The two ladies seem to be the only companions for each other; and they set out together to live in her native Italian city. And here comes the winding up in a most remarkable last scene. Aurora is sitting in her house near Florence, under the full persuasion that Romney

Leigh is on the point of being married, if he be not married already, to that detestable Lady Waldemar, when he himself appears before her. He is stone-blind, owing to an accident, or something worse, that befell him at the burning of his house, Leigh Hall, which had been set on fire by the mob. He is cured of his socialism, but for his eyesight there is no recovery. He gives her various hints of this calamity; sometimes very tropically, as in the line,

“The sun is silent, but Aurora speaks,”

and sometimes in broken words; but she remains wholly unsuspicuous of it, till he plainly tells her that such is the fact, at the end of a very long dialogue. It comes out that, so far from having any matrimonial engagement with Lady Waldemar, he has come from England to wed Marian Erle, to adopt her boy, and to introduce them both to his grand acquaintances. But Marian, who enters at the moment, peremptorily refuses her consent to a union that would be felt to degrade him. Thereupon Aurora astonishes Leigh with the most passionate protestations of the affection which she acknowledges she had always felt for him. As he had thought to redeem society by phalansteries and outward contrivance, and found himself miserably deluded; so she, who had thought to redeem it by poetry and aesthetics, confessed that her experiment in that opposite direction had met with an equal failure. The whole ardor of her nature runs towards her early and only love. He meets her, after a little conscientious coyness, with corresponding emotions, and their “two large explosive hearts” join together in one of the most wondrous embraces ever described. So ends the romance.

The language in which it is set forth is of a piece with the unnatural story. Sharpness and force are its presiding powers. Its verse is often but foamy prose; its phrases are often such as misbecome the pen of a lady. Notwithstanding our ready admission that it is sometimes condensed into admirable vigor, sometimes rises to something like sublimity, and sometimes flows into figures of ingenious beauty, we are compelled to pronounce it in general to be turgid, pedantic, affected, obscure (though not to such depths of darkness as we have to complain of in Mr. Robert Browning), and on some other accounts, not suggested by either of these adjectives, eminently disagreeable. If the reader wishes to know what is meant by the Strain and Stress poetry, here is an example or two, merely for the sake of illustration. The first shall be so mild that it strangely tempts one to admire it:

“My loose hair began to burn and creep,
Alive to the very ends, about my knees:

I swept it backward as the wind sweeps flame,
With the passion of my hands."

Another specimen will so tempt but few persons :

" They burnt Leigh Hall ; but if consummated
To devils, heightened above Lucifers,
They had burnt instead a star or two, of those
We saw above there just a moment back,
Before the morn abolished them, — destroyed
And riddled them in ashes through a sieve
On the head of the foundering universe, — what then ? "

Surely, " Mad Nat Lee " never said anything madder. There would be no end to such quotations. Here is the last :

" I flung closer to his breast,
As sword, that, after battle, flings to sheath " ; —

a figure of speech which is certainly more trenchant than lucid, and a sort of English that defies criticism. We need not wonder, after this, to hear the enamored Aurora say :

" And in that hurtle of united souls,
we felt the old earth spin,
And all the starry turbulence of worlds
Swing round us in their *audient* circles, till
If that same golden moon were overhead
Or if beneath our feet, we did not know."

The celebrated kiss, that was so laughed at a long time ago for shaking the woods in which it took place, was a slight performance compared with this, which brought down the Seven Stars and Arcturus to its audience.

In our opinion, " Aurora Leigh " is not only obnoxious to a critical judgment and a sensitive taste, but often offends one's sense of propriety and feelings of reverence. It deals largely in what is repulsive and loathsome ; while it uses the Holy Name with a looseness and prodigality that make us shrink. We hazard the surmise, and take no great risk therein, that the word God, used of the Supreme Being, does not occur more frequently in the whole twelve books of the *Paradise Lost* than it does in this boisterous love-tale.

Mrs. Browning's idea of a poet is of one who says,

" With his voice like a thunder... This is soul,
This is life, this word *is being said* in heaven,
Here 's God down on us ! what are you about ? "

The scholar teaches her

" how God laughs in heaven, when any man
Says, ' Here I 'm learned ; this I understand.' "

That daring flight of Scripture imagery, which is made endurable, even in the Psalmist, only by the wrath and disdain that gave wing to it, makes a mean show, when imped and aped in this free-and-easy fashion. As Mrs. Browning is versed in many things, she gives us a lesson in theology also. For example, she assures us that

"*God's self* would never have come down *to die*,
Could man have thanked him for it?"

and again she exclaims,—

"Alas, long-suffering and most patient God,
Aspire, aspire
From henceforth for me! (?) thou who hast, thyself,
Endured this *fleshhood*."

Enough of an unwelcome task. We have felt it a duty to bear this testimony against the present clamor of applause, from which we most earnestly dissent, and which we do not believe to agree with the silent judgment of our own or any other literary community. Some writers, in their admiration of this book, are ready to claim for it the dignity of an epic. And truly, its verbal dimensions are on the epic scale; it is written in the verse which Milton not only employed, but almost prescribed, for that species of composition; and one might almost affirm that neither the celestial machinery of the Tale of Troy, nor the infernal machinery of the Jerusalem Delivered, is farther removed from credibility and the world of fact, than the events that are here supposed to pass in our modern cities.

With submission, we cannot commend this poem any the more for the fact that none but an author of genius could have written it. Its vices are those of a new and pretending school, that seem to challenge notice and deference. Its distempers are catching; such as will be likely to communicate themselves to many who only fancy that they are clever or inspired. Bad examples are the most mischievous in the highest places.

A Journey through Texas, or a Saddle-trip on the Southwestern Frontier, with a Statistical Appendix. By F. L. OLMSTEAD. New York: Dix, Edwards, & Co. 1857. 12mo. pp. 516.

THIS is the third publication of a very graphic, impartial, story-telling traveller, who understands the art of making a large book readable, and of arousing his reader by his perfectly

calm narrative of what is offensive and monstrous in Southern slavery. Estimating his general fidelity by his picture of what we have ourselves seen in Western travel, bating the imperfection of limited knowledge, inaccurate information, and a careless style, we accept this bulky book as the most thorough picture thus far drawn of Texas, especially in regard to the workings of slavery upon its virgin soil.

In countless conversations with negroes, Indians, Mexicans, Creoles, Germans, and Americans, the New England farmer intends that we shall form impressions for ourselves; as if we were seeking health in a free canter over these unoccupied prairies at the Southwest. Once only he declares outright, that, "from a thorough examination of Southern agriculture, we have been convinced that slave labor is everywhere uneconomical and cruel, and to a man of Northern habits to the last degree annoying." And certainly his means of knowing were abundant, as he passed over the principal emigrant and mail routes at the rate of fourteen miles a day, stopping of course at about every fifteenth house upon his track.

His first evidence is given as to the contented yet amazing ignorance of the people. "In our whole journey through Eastern Texas, we did not see one of the inhabitants look into a newspaper or book, although we spent several days in houses where men were lounging about the fire without occupation." Among the German emigrants, many of them of high character like the Governor of Comorn, he found an entirely different state of things,—in fact, a reproduction under obvious drawbacks of the tastes manifested at home. But, with this striking exception, Mr. Olmstead encountered everywhere the same absence of literature, the same distaste for reading, the same disregard of the means of intellectual improvement. That he should be travelling for information seemed to them perfectly unaccountable; and he found it advisable at every place to explain his purposes as fully as if questioned by an Austrian police at a frontier post.

A second incidental evidence against the system of slaveholding in a new country is its besetting sin of laziness. Potatoes were selling at six dollars a bushel for seed; corn, at a dollar and a half; maize was wholly an importation; oats were nowhere threshed. On one farm of fifty cows no milk or butter was in use. The negroes were too lazy, and the master too indifferent, to churn or milk. Very commonly the windows were without glass, the doors could hardly be shut, the stars could be seen from one's bed through the roof. In the midst of game, nothing better than pork was the ordinary fare.

As a result, many parts of this new territory were going

backwards, with all the advantage of "being the finest and most attractive field" for the experiment of an Emigrant Society in the United States. "Accessible as it is with the greatest ease and the least expense from the crowded centres of the world, and having every natural quality that can attract population in greater measure than any Northern rival," there are already signs of decay, and in the Eastern central portion, considerable districts have already been exhausted, and a decrease of population taken place. Along the Sabine were many abandoned farms. In Liberty County graziers were taking the place of planters, the country retrograding, the French Creoles sinking into poverty and selling slave after slave in order to live. Galveston merchants were sometimes seen to leave Liberty with a dozen negroes taken for debt from their French owners.

One pleasant change is noted in Texas. With the increase of American occupation, the rivers grow deeper simply through the growth of the forests; the soil becomes more moist, and its capacity of production is augmented, as well as its facility of culture.

With one of the best bear stories that we remember, the space which this book can claim will be exhausted. A German hunter had wounded a bear, which had disappeared among the rocks. He determined, with a companion's aid, to capture him. But the deep hole into which the creature had dropped was too small to be entered in the usual way. So, the hunter was held by the heels, while with his hands he succeeded in fastening a rope around his dying trophy, which proved to be of the largest size. But while half smothered in the cave, he heard an indistinct growl; so, arming himself with a freshly capped revolver, and a bowie-knife in his teeth, he crept in once more, and heard close before him the steady breathing of a bear. Aiming at the sound, he fired two barrels, and retreated as quick as possible. Going back to their hut they procured some pine torches, and repaired to the spot, attended by their neighbors, to find, upon entering, that a second bear lay dead within the hole. After this body was duly dragged into daylight, the hunter tried to explore the cleft farther, and came upon another bear, which had probably been smothered by the smoke of the shot which killed his companion. Removing him again, the hunter advanced head foremost once more, and was met by a savage roar and the glare of fiery eyes directly in advance. He attempted to retreat, but a neighbor had followed him so closely as to block up the way. There was nothing to do but to fire where he saw the eyes; but when he could look again, those eyes seemed glaring upon him still in another direction; so that he was obliged to fire once

more at these furious eyeballs. When he could see again, they had vanished ; and creeping forward cautiously, he found two warm carcasses; each shot between the eyes ; making a whole Bruin family which had perished by this one man's intrepidity. A famous story, even if immensely exaggerated.

Life in Israel, or Portraitures of Hebrew Character. By MARIA T. RICHARDS. New York : Sheldon, Blakeman, & Co. 1857. 12mo. pp. 389.

THIS book is one of the best of its class. But its class we cannot commend. It is rather singular that the sects which are most zealous for "the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible," should furnish romancers who find it necessary to make Scripture clear by embellishments of fancy, by stories of *love*, and by the addition of new characters and personages. In this book, we cannot see that the genius of Mrs. Richards has added anything to the historical narrative, or has made the scenes of the desert wandering, the kingdom of Solomon, and the captivity in Babylon any more distinct and attractive. Her stories are only a dilution of Scripture, with higher coloring, it may be, but with far less body and reality, than the accounts of Exodus, of the Kings, and of the Book of Daniel. We cannot advise any one to go to her book in preference to the Bible itself, either for amusement or for instruction. It costs more, while it tells less.

We have three special exceptions to take to the book. The first is to the character of its quotations, in which passages are used according to their sound rather than their sense, are put into the mouths of those who could not have uttered them, and are attributed to writers who never wrote them. In several instances, words are quoted from "David" which neither are called his in the Scripture, nor are supposed to be his by the best critics; as, for instance, the one hundred and fiftieth Psalm, which was probably composed long after the death of David, and was certainly not extant in his time.

A second exception is to the representation of the Messianic hope among the Jews. There is no evidence in the Scripture that this hope was either in quality or quantity what Mrs. Richards describes it to be. There is no evidence that the prophecy of Balaam or the prophecies of Isaiah were understood in the ages which come into her view, as she tells us that they were. That vision of Moses on Pisgah, as recorded on p. 130, is not

according to the record in Deuteronomy, nor is it according to good sense. We must answer an emphatic "No!" to Mrs. Richards's earnest questions. And we commend her cautious remark : "But the glorious vision of Pisgah was past ; and if these things appeared not thence unto Moses, how soon were they unfolded him when he worshipped on the mount of God above, and walked in the light of Paradise."

A third exception is to the style in which Mrs. Richards chooses to give us the dialogues of her characters. Why should the ancient Jews always be made in novels to talk in the English of King James's day ? The language of that age is no more fit for Jews than it is for Greeks and Romans. There is no reason why invented personages should adopt obsolete English colloquial speech as the best imitation of Hebrew. Mrs. Richards has fallen into the very common error of confounding the race of Abraham with the Puritans ; as if the modern imitation were in all respects the best type of the original.

With these exceptions, adding to them perhaps the too frequent use of such phrases as "ever and anon," we can praise the execution of the work. Its spirit is excellent, and its literary merit is considerable.

The Blemmertons, or Dottings by the Wayside. By the Reverend JOSEPH J. NICHOLSON. New York : Dana & Co. 1856. 12mo pp. 423.

THE emblem of Messrs. Dana & Co. is a dial-plate, and their motto is, "Redeeming the Time." They discharge that laudable duty by issuing constant instalments of Church gossip, the satirical labors of sound Church clergymen. As yet, we have discovered among their clerical coadjutors no rival of Swift, Sterne, or Sydney Smith. Mr. Nicholson is the most brilliant specimen that we have met with, among the time-redeemers. If not a great wit or a great satirist, he is certainly a spirited and entertaining writer. We agree with his own account of himself, that he may "sometimes be sentimental, but never profound." His book conclusively shows that he is "but little versed in *anthroposophy*." Its inconsistencies, though numerous, are pardonable, in consideration of its sprightliness, and its egotism has the merit of excessive frankness. He is at once, in his own view, very thoughtful and very impulsive, very orthodox and very tolerant. He quotes Scripture very oddly, taking care to give his authorities, chapter and

verse. He does not seem to believe in philanthropists or in factories, and says that *he has seen* "scores of white men" *dropping dead at their posts* from heat. That vision implies a visit to the regions below, since no such case is recorded in any iron-works of this country or England. Indeed, Mr. Nicholson's assertions are often of the free-and-easy sort. We doubt the fact, that in our American mills and workshops "infidelity rules and reigns," as much as we doubt the fact that the Church of England provides for all classes of her children so much better than we do.

Mr. Nicholson is strong on the subject of "*sects*," upon "the Apostolic succession" and the "Sacraments," upon the "sin of schism," upon the use of consecrated churchyards for the un-hallowed burials of sectarians, upon the "*awful* doctrines of the Incarnation and Atonement," upon that radical spirit which "would tear the diadem from the brow of Jesus Christ, reeking afresh with gore," upon the condescending care of the clergy in the South for "the colored population," upon the exceeding danger of *sincerity* in sectarianism, &c., &c., with double, treble, and quadruple panegyries on the Church. The brief remarks upon "gossiping" will strike a reader as very edifying, especially in the historic contrast by which they are illustrated. Mr. Nicholson is impressed with this "portentous evil." It is "pragmatical, officious, intermeddling, inimical to the Gospel," and Mr. Nicholson mildly hints that it will end in eternal woe. *Boyle* was "no gossiper," while Bacon, in the ingenious phrase of Mr. Nicholson, was "tinctured with a pragmatical disposition."

We are favored, in the course of the volume, with several sermons, which those who would redeem the time by a refreshing laugh will do well to read. One is on the subject of *foxes*. The treatment is evangelical and Scriptural. St. Augustine, St. Paul, Ezekiel, Herod, and the Canticles are all referred to. The discourse on "Jacob and Esau" gives some "affecting pictures," and opens some high flights of imagination. Some of the pictures which Mr. Nicholson draws remind us forcibly of Punch in Naples, and there is a frequent resemblance in his style to the lectures of panoramic directors. The way in which James Fas-tidious and his company of boys go marching off from the Rev. Dr. Riproarer's Sunday school, back to the true Church, is a caution to all lax and schismatical fathers and mothers. Are we to receive the sketch of Professor Jeremy Kiteflyer's thorough Church School as a fair instance of seminaries of this kind? The spectacle of that excellent woman, the Rev. Mrs. Lovegood, hurling a goose out of the window at Mr. Friendly's head, is decidedly novel.

But it would require too many pages to cull and exhibit the beauties of this remarkable satirical novel. Even a catalogue of the strange names would tax our capacity too far. Allright, Singman, Hardworker, Nochurch, Fussy, Slopill, Skyrocket, Cobblecanting, McMeddlesome, Highflyer, Riproarer,—these will give an idea of the picturesque variety. Shall we descend to verbal criticism, and object to the frequent use of such words as *opine*? We offer only a gem from the casket, as Mr. Nicholson would say, in the following perspicuous sentence. “The young imbibe these lessons with ease; it is in harmony with their nature, which loves to look upon the beautiful; and, if aptly trained, the lessons so imbibed will be developed in that glowing piety, which in every bursting bud and opening flower seeth the hand divine which lavisheth beauty on all things here below.”

Rockford Parish, or the Fortunes of Mr. Mason's Successors.
By JOHN N. NORTON, A. M. New York: Dana & Co.
1856. 16mo. pp. 216.

As we briefly introduced our readers to the martyr who made in Kentucky “full proof of the ministry,” it is but just that we should see how his successors have fared. The same high-toned observation, the same large charity, the same modesty and humility, which were noted in Mr. Norton’s previous volume, are patent in this. A few extracts will show the quality of this pious and timely production.

On p. 19 we learn how ministers bear the cross: “Although it is sometimes awkward for one to enter a house, and to introduce himself, still, he should be willing to bear this light cross for the sake of the holy cause in which he is engaged.”

On p. 44 it is said that “every faithful pastor should see that the fences of the fold are kept up, because the sheep can be prevented from wandering abroad in no other way.” We may remark, in general, that writers of Mr. Norton’s tribe have a great affection for pastoral metaphor, and love to talk about “folds” and “fences,” as if the whole duty of the Church were to keep its members shut up in pens, in daytime as well as night-time.

On the next page, the practice of bowing at the name of Christ in the creed is justified by the practice of the “venerable Bishop Mead” and the “very admirable remarks” of that high and orthodox authority, “Charlotte Elizabeth.” Farther on, we are told that “the case of St. Philip proves the validity of baptism by a *Deacon*”; a specimen of exegesis equally happy and

sagacious, for this great question was in the dispute one of the "knotty points."

On page 66, Mr. Norton speaks pleasantly of a missionary preaching "in a kitchen," becoming "a lion," and calling out "a good congregation." On page 84, the attacks of Dr. Sampson Slashgill, the revival preacher, are mentioned as "furnishing many persons with weapons with which to inflict wounds and bruises upon the 'Body' of our blessed Lord," — that "Body of the Lord" being a little handful of Episcopalian in the town of Bedfordville. And here we may add, that Mr. Norton continues by significant names to mark and demolish every variety of schism, heresy, and error. It is the Rev. Capt. Buncombe who preaches a "crack sermon" from the text, "Nine and twenty knives." On page 102 occurs this crushing argument, with which the gifted Mr. Howard silences a "Popish emissary." "If it had been God's will that the services of his Church should be in Latin, the miracle on the day of Pentecost would have been confined to the single gift of the Latin tongue." Of course, to that argument no reply could be made. It is natural, after this, that Protestants should be rebuked (p. 112) for selling old churches to Catholics, thus "furnishing a shelter for the enemy."

Rev. Albert Barnes is a special subject of our author's dislike. His Commentaries are said to contain "false doctrine," and surprise is expressed because Episcopalian, "both clergy and laity, will encourage the circulation of his books among families and Sunday schools." All this, because Mr. Barnes does not believe that the Scriptures contain any account of "Christmas," or "Easter," or "confirmation." If any one would see how the genuineness of "Christmas" can be "established beyond a doubt," let him read the masterly *two-page* discussion in Chapter 21 of this volume. The question is *settled*, and Jesus was born on the 25th day of December, beyond mistake. In a remark on page 138 we are happy to agree, extending it, however, to agents for the sale of clerical books such as this. "We should be far more particular than we are in demanding suitable credentials from those who are so constantly travelling about, as clergymen, or candidates for holy orders, or agents for Church institutions." On page 150, Mr. Howard's evasive excuse for not inviting his Hardshell Baptist brother to sit with him in the pulpit, is commended. To tell the truth would have aroused "prejudice." In Chapter 29 are given Mr. Norton's views on the subject of *prayer*. Not to pray for *rain* exhibits a "want of faith." It is better, he thinks, to solicit the Lord than to aid Professor Espy. The sermon on prayer for rain is edifying in the extreme; and it seems that the Lord heeded the

prayers of Rockford, and on that Sunday afternoon repeated for the fainting region the miracle vouchsafed to Elijah. Down came the rain, when the sermon was done. On page 191 we have the cheering statement that "the worship of the redeemed in glory will be something akin to the liturgic strains to which we have been accustomed in the Church on earth." Dr. Tyng and the Epistle to the Colossians are the authorities for this statement. It must be refreshing to hear in heaven the prayer for rain and the Nicene Creed. Of course the Church is called "the Ark of God," "Zion," and all the appropriate names, which are usual in sacred description. There is a degree of charming simplicity in the remark on page 21, "that the walls of Zion would not totter, though you and I should both be driven from the fold by a cause as trifling as that which has just been described." This cause was "an ill-bred stripling, in squeaking boots," who went out of meeting during service.

Forty chapters the author promised. He has faithfully given them, allowing an average of five pages to each. He delicately hints at the close, that more may be forthcoming, if the public express a wish. The Church cannot be so ungrateful as to refuse the hint.

The Sisters Abroad, or an Italian Journey. Boston: Whittemore, Niles, and Hall. 1857. 16mo. pp. 267.

WE have our suspicions as to the authorship of this pleasant child's book, but dare not express them. It is evidently written by one who knows and idolizes Mrs. Browning, who has stayed some time at the Baths of Lucca, who has made a sea-voyage between Italy and Boston, and who had a great interest in Margaret Fuller. It was written for her sister's children. They will certainly want another of the same sort, which shall tell what is here left out; something about Milan and Verona and Padua, and something more about Venice and Rome. We hope for a series of Italian *Story-Books*, which shall go with the Rollo and Parley series.

Two Years Ago. By the REV. CHARLES KINGSLEY, author of "Amyas Leigh," etc. Boston: Ticknor and Fields. 1857. 12mo. pp. 540.

As the reader might infer from its title, and from the character of his previous works, Mr. Kingsley's new novel is designed

to illustrate some of the recent phases of life and thought in England. For no man is more thoroughly alive to the actual condition of things, or more deeply interested in the questions of the day, than is Mr. Kingsley. However far back he may go for the epoch of any of his stories, or however skilfully he may array his personages in the dress of other days, it is almost always with a reference to the present that he writes. Indeed, we can hardly conceive of his writing a book into which this element should not very largely enter. In his new story he has not only dealt with recent topics, but he has laid his scene in recent times, and has drawn his incidents from familiar occurrences. Its style is in general equal to that of his best works. He notes the beauties of nature with the eye of a scientific observer, and paints them with the hand of an artist. There are frequent passages which will be read again and again for the marvellous felicity with which the scene is painted. Mr. Kingsley excels in description much more than in dialogue or in narrative; yet there are passages of trenchant sarcasm and cogent argument which stand out from his page and cannot fail to arrest the most cursory reader. The principal characters have the vitality and self-consistency of real personages, and we follow their fortunes and the development of their inner life with much of the interest which springs from a personal acquaintance. The minor characters are more feebly conceived and drawn. Their introduction, it must be admitted, is a real blemish in the book. The plot is simple enough in its outline, but it is encumbered by needless accessories; and the book would be improved by being cut down to a more moderate length. The story of Stangrave and Marie is a mere episode, which weakens the interest of the principal story by distracting the reader's attention.

Like all the writers of the school of which he is so conspicuous an ornament, Mr. Kingsley addresses the public too often, and at too great length, for the maintenance of his reputation. No man, even with his splendid powers and zeal in the work in which he is engaged, can bear such a constant draft without repeating himself or diluting his productions. It is not many years since he first became known to the public, and he is already the author of twelve or fifteen books, besides numerous contributions to periodical literature. Both *Amyas Leigh* and *Two Years Ago* are of a length which in itself must be considered a fault. In truth, it is to the rapidity with which he composes, and his unwillingness to cancel anything that he has written, that we must ascribe the defects of plan and execution in the work under notice. We have already intimated that it is too long. At least one third could be spared, and the book would assume a more artistic

form by the omission. Its other defects are evidently those of haste, and need not be enlarged on here; for its healthful tone would reconcile us to much graver defects than any which are apparent in either of Mr. Kingsley's latest works. Still, their existence in the works of an author so deservedly popular is to be regretted. Nothing short of the highest excellence can satisfy us in his case. We ought to add, however, that we have read this work with the same pleasure which we experienced in reading his previous books, and have discovered no evidence in it of failing powers.

The English Bible. History of the Translation of the Holy Scriptures into the English Tongue. With Specimens of the old English Versions. By MRS. H. C. CONANT. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman, & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 466.

A GREAT deal of valuable information will be found in Mrs. Conant's excellent volume, and a careful perusal of it by those who are not versed in the scholarship of its subject will largely help to relieve them from the influence of much superstition about the Bible, and will enlighten them on the question of the desirableness of a revision of our common version. The authoress has made a judicious selection from the masses of material for illustrating her subject. She is accurate in the statement of facts. The tendency of such works, when thus fairly written, with manifest reverence and sincerity of purpose, is to strengthen faith in the truths of the Bible, and to prove that its intelligent use is safe and edifying.

An Analytical Concordance to the Holy Scriptures; or, The Bible presented under Distinct and Classified Heads or Topics. Edited by JOHN EADIE, D.D., LL.D. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. 1857. 8vo. pp. lxiv. and 776.

THIS work was suggested by, but is an improvement upon, Matthew Talbot's "Analysis of the Holy Bible." The design of it is most excellent; and considering the well-nigh insuperable difficulties attending any attempt to carry it out, the execution may be pronounced quite successful. The general subjects which compose the substance of Scripture are distinguished un-

der the titles significant of their respective materials ; and each of these, being followed out into subdivisions, sometimes very minute and specific, is made a caption for all the texts of the Bible where reference is made to it. The volume of course differs greatly from a Concordance, which deals with words rather than with subjects. One of the best uses of the work will be found in its comprehensive arrangement of passages scattered through the whole Bible under leading topics, thus enabling the reader to peruse the sacred volume under one of the conditions best suited for making it its own expositor. The purchaser of the book does in fact buy a copy of the same Bible which he may have in the common form, with this improvement or help introduced, that its contents are classified and arranged under topics.

MESSRS. Ticknor and Fields have published the first four volumes of their edition of the Waverley Novels, containing Waverley and Guy Mannering ; and two volumes more, containing the Antiquary, will be ready early in May. From these volumes we are able to form an opinion of the merits of this edition ; and we need not hesitate to say, that it more than fulfils the promise of the publishers' prospectus. In compactness of form, beauty of typography and illustration, and in cheapness of price, nothing better need be desired. We need scarcely add that the publication of so beautiful an edition of these celebrated works is a gratifying proof that the reading public demand and will encourage the production of books of a higher moral and intellectual tone than satisfied their wants ten or fifteen years since.

INTELLIGENCE.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

MESSRS. Phillips, Sampson, & Co. have published "Arctic Adventure by Sea and Land, from the earliest Date to the last Expeditions in Search of Sir John Franklin." This most interesting and valuable volume comes opportunely to the service of thousands whom the pages of Dr. Kane's work have made to thirst for just such information as they will find here. It is prepared by the skilful pen of Mr. Epes Sargent, and therefore with good taste and excellent judgment. It is also well furnished with maps and illustrations. (12mo. pp. 480.)

Messrs. Whittemore, Niles, and Hall have published a neat volume (12mo, pp. 408) containing brief biographies of Addison, Atterbury, Bacon, Butler, Howard, Bunyan, Horace, Robert Hall, Sir John Franklin, Homer, Goldsmith, Gibbon, Gassendi, Crichton, Dr. Johnson, Davy, and Hume, from the pens of Macaulay, Henry Rogers, T. Martin, H. Dixon, W. Spalding, Sir John Richardson, and others. The last issued volume, the twelfth, of the new edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica has furnished some of the freshest and the best of these memoirs.

The same firm have issued, in a beautiful miniature volume (32mo, pp. 304), Poems by Charles Swain.

Messrs. Ticknor and Fields have accompanied their two miniature volumes, containing Longfellow's Poems, with two in similar style containing his Prose Works (32mo, pp. 455, 475).

The same firm propose to publish a reprint of an English volume of Sermons by the late Rev. Frederick W. Robertson, of Trinity Chapel, Brighton. Our attention was drawn to these Sermons by some high encomiums pronounced upon them in the best foreign critical journals. We have read them with profound interest, and have been carried along by their earnestness of tone, their liberality of sentiment, their novelty of illustration, and their devout spirit. We assure such of our readers as enjoy this class of literary productions, that they will find in the promised volume the highest qualities of the modern style of good preaching. There is something in the writer's tone, method, and utterance which wins to him our love and confidence as one of the choice and noble spirits who renew one's faith in preaching, in the fertility of appeal yet unexhausted in high truths, and in the capabilities of the Christian ministry. Three of the sermons, viz. those on the Grecian, the Roman, and the Barbarian, show some of the choicest gifts of mind and spirit.

The American Unitarian Association have published, as the fourth volume of their Devotional Library, a volume entitled "The Harp and the Cross." It contains a collection of sacred poetry, compiled by Rev. S. G. Bulfinch. A pure taste and a catholic spirit have presided over the undertaking. The task has often been performed for a selection of religious poems, and always finds a large circle of appreciating read-

ers. The pieces are upon Gospel themes; from writers of various fellowships; drawn from English and American sources; some of them stamped with the approval of time and trial, some of them new.

Messrs. Gould and Lincoln, who have shown such zeal in the speedy publication of the popular writings of Hugh Miller, have issued, contemporaneously with the foreign publishers, that author's last work, which he had just completed at the time of his melancholy death. Its title is, "The Testimony of the Rocks; or, Geology in its Bearings on the two Theologies, Natural and Revealed" (12mo, pp. 502). A memorial of the death and character of Mr. Miller introduces the work, which is profusely illustrated by the graver's art. We have not had time to do more than merely announce the appearance of the volume. A profound interest has anticipated it, and we with many others are looking for light and wisdom from it. Our only misgiving is lest the author may have attempted too much.

The third volume of Mr. Barry's excellent History of Massachusetts has appeared, embracing the period of the Revolution, and coming down to the revision of the Constitution. The work, we think, will be the favorite History of the Commonwealth in New England households, to engage the interest of all the members of a family.

Mr. John Bartlett, of Cambridge, has published an excellent Manual of "Introductory Lessons on Morals, and Christian Evidences," by Archbishop Whately, under the editorial oversight of Professor Huntington.

Also, "A Text-Book of Analytic Geometry, on the Basis of Professor Peirce's Treatise," by his son, Tutor James Mills Peirce.

Charles Scribner, of New York, has published (2 vols. 8vo, pp. 479, 492) "The New England History, from the Discovery of the Continent to the Declaration of Independence," by Charles W. Elliott. From the cursory examination which we have made of the volumes, we feel justified in commending them. We approve of the method of the author, in relating the whole of a story and in treating a distinct topic in a continuous chapter, even when he has to pick out and connect its incidents and details over a course of years. The reader thus has complete instead of fragmentary narratives, given by themselves instead of spread over the whole work. He writes with spirit, and he loves humor. He will not greatly please the idolaters of the Puritans, for he occasionally makes fun of them, or rather finds fun in them and in their doings. But in the main he is just, accurate, and interesting.

The same publisher contributes to the religious instruction of the great public the four volumes whose titles follow:—

The Doctrine of Baptisms. Scriptural Examination of the Questions respecting, 1. The Translation of Baptizo, 2. The Mode of Baptism, 3. The Subjects of Baptism. By George D. Armstrong, D. D. (12mo. pp. 322.)

A Book of Public Prayer, compiled from the authorized Formularies of Worship of the Presbyterian Church, as prepared by the Reformers Calvin, Knox, Butler, and others. With Supplementary Forms. (12mo. pp. 360.)

The Bible in the Workshop; or, Christianity the Friend of Labor. By Rev. John W. Mears. (12mo. pp. 344.)

The Sceptical Era in Modern History ; or, The Infidelity of the Eighteenth Century, the Product of Spiritual Despotism. By T. M. Post. (12mo. pp. 264.)

The same publisher has issued the first volume of a proposed series of small works, by Mrs. L. H. Sigourney, of "Examples from the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries" (16mo, pp. 349). It contains memorials of great and good men and women.

Messrs. G. P. Putnam & Co. have issued a reprint of the London edition of Sir Benjamin Brodie's excellent and comprehensive essay on "Mind and Matter ; or, Physiological Inquiries intended to illustrate the Mutual Relations of the Physical Organization and the Mental Faculties." (12mo. pp. 279.)

The same firm have published an admirable story of Puritan life and manners by J. G. Holland, the faithful historian of Western Massachusetts. He has wrought up history and fiction with marked fidelity to truth and with fine imagination in this story ; which is entitled "The Bay-Path : a Tale of New England Colonial Life." (12mo. pp. 418.)

The busy press of Mr. Redfield, which must be presided over by one skilled in selecting wisely for a good literary taste, has recently furnished the following works : —

A reprint in two volumes (12mo, pp. 354, 366) of the London edition of Dr. Doran's gossipy and charming work, bearing the quaint and most expressive title of "Monarchs retired from Business," — the exiled, the deposed, the abdicating sovereigns of all times and all lands.

The Fraserian Papers of the late William Maginn, LL. D., annotated, with a Life of the Author, by R. Shelton Mackenzie, D. C. L. (12mo. pp. 358.)

Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge, by Richard Chenevix Trench, D. D. (12mo, pp. 137.) We cannot say much in praise of these five discourses on some points of the Scripture doctrine of Christ. They do not manifest the power and talent of the author shown in some of his other works. There is in them a straining after something not within his reach, and an exaggeration or perversion of truth.

Messrs. Dix, Edwards, & Co., of New York, have published a piquant volume, entitled "Greece and the Greeks of the Present Day." It is professedly a translation from the French of "Edmond About." (16mo. pp. 360.)

Also, "Life of Tai-ping-wang, Chief of the Chinese Insurrection," by J. Milton Mackie (16mo, pp. 371). The volume bears the marks of authenticity, and is written in a very lively and engaging manner.

Also, "The Confidence-Man: his Masquerade." By Herman Melville. (12mo, pp. 394.) The well-proved genius and brilliant powers of Mr. Melville dispose us to expect pleasure when we have time to peruse the volume.

Also, from the same firm, we have "Brittany and La Vendée. Tales and Sketches. With a Notice of the Life and Literary Character of Emile Souvestre." (16mo, pp. 301.) Souvestre is a writer of pure taste and morals, and is a favorite with readers of various ages.

From the press of the Messrs. Harper we have the four following volumes:—

"Villas and Cottages. A Series of Designs prepared for Execution in the United States, by Calvert Vaux, Architect. Illustrated by three hundred Engravings." (8vo, pp. 318.) A book filled with charming views of rural residences, with specifications of their construction and cost.

A new volume of the Life of Mary Queen of Scots, in continuation (Vol. VI.) of the series of the Lives of Scottish Queens and English Princesses, by Agnes Strickland. (12mo. pp. 365.)

"The Days of My Life. An Autobiography," by the Author of "Margaret Maitland." (12mo, pp. 428.) A reprint of a fresh English work of much beauty and interest.

Elements of Plane and Solid Geometry, together with the Elements of Plane and Spherical Trigonometry, and an Article on Inverse Trigonometrical Functions," by G. B. Docharty, LL.D. (12mo. pp. 189.)

A very happily chosen theme, very happily treated, may be found in a volume (square 12mo, pp. 345) published by Wiley and Halsted, New York, entitled "The Story of a Pocket Bible," with illustrations.

A work, which we have not had time to examine, on an interesting theme, published by T. N. Stanford, New York, bears the title, "The Connections of the Universe, as seen in the Light of God's created and written Revelations." (12mo. pp. 315.)

A. S. Barnes & Co., New York, have published "Morals for the Young; or, Good Principles instilling Wisdom. Illustrated with Engravings and Moral Stories." By Emma Willard. (12mo. pp. 217.)

The work which now holds greedy readers in anxious expectation is the promised publication, by the Appletons, of Mrs. Gaskell's Life of Miss Brontë, author of Jane Eyre. The extracts which have appeared in the newspapers, and the highly estimated abilities of Mrs. Gaskell, warrant us in looking for a work of great power and interest.

INDEX.

A.

Akka, the City of, Dr. Robinson's Account of, 169.
Alexander and Aristotle, their Relations, Mr. Grote on, 65.
Alexander, the City of, 69.
Alger, Rev. W. R., his Poetry of the East, noticed, 138.
Almanac, the American, for 1857, noticed, 150.
Arctic Expeditions, Account of, 238-262.
Arianism in England, M. Remusat on, 439.
Aristotle, View of, by Mr. Grote, 65.
Arminius, 4 — The Arminian Controversy, 1-27 — Calvinistic Persecution of the Arminians, 23.
Arnold, Dr., his Influence, 441.
Atheism, Dr. Buchanan on, 445.
Athens, Glory of, 59, 63.

B.

Barneveldt, John Owen, 3 — Imprisonment of, 19 — Execution of, 21.
Bible, New Views of the, 345 — Proposed Revision of the English Version of the, 363.
Browning, Elizabeth B., her Aurora Leigh, noticed, 461.
Buchanan, Dr. J., on Atheism, reviewed, with extracts, 445-460.
Byron, Lord, Mr. Webster's Estimate of, 383.

C.

Calvinists, their Persecution of the Arminians, 23.
Cartwright, Peter, Autobiography of, noticed, 312.
Celtic Doctrine of a Future Life, Article on, 88-92.
Child, Mrs. M. L., on Heathen Religions, 189.
Christ, Doctrine concerning, in Philippians ii. 5-8, 402-433.
Coleridge, his Influence in England, 441.

Conant, Mrs. H. C., on the English Bible, noticed, 475.
Congregational Ministers, Doctor Sprague's Memoirs of, 115.
Cotton, Mr. Webster's Letter on the Cultivation of, 385.

D.

Darley, F. O. C., his Illustrations of Judd's "Margaret," noticed, 149.
Davidson, Dr. S., his Editorship of Horne's Introduction to the Scriptures, noticed, 302.
Development, Law of Physical, 451.
Dickens, Charles, his Stories for Little Folks, 143.
Doré, by a Stroller in Europe, noticed, 317.
Dort, the Synod of, Article on, 1-27 — Occasion of, 7 — Outrages, 11 — Call and Composition of the Synod, 14 — Its canons, 17.
Druidical Doctrine of a Future Life, Article on, 88, 92 — Triads of Druidism, 91.
Dualism, Theory of, 197.

E.

Eadie, Dr. John, his Analytical Scripture Concordance, 475.
Eliot, Samuel, his Manual of United States History, 141.
Episcopius, 5.
Esquimaux, Character of the, 253.

F.

Faith and Logic, 449.
Fillmore, President, Webster's Letters to, 377.
Franklin, Sir John, his Arctic Expeditions, 239 — Search for, 241.

G.

Geier, Dr. Robert, on Alexander and Aristotle, 55.
Generation, Spontaneous, the Doctrine of, 454.

Geology, the Religion of, Hitchcock's, 457.
 Glaciers, Nature of, 255 — Movement of, 257.
 Gordon, Rev. Dr. W. R., his Three-fold Test of Modern Spiritualism, noticed, 133.
 Gore, Governor, of Massachusetts, 381.
 Grinnell Arctic Expeditions, reviewed, 238 — 262.
 Grote, George, his History of Greece, reviewed, 55 — 73 — His Spelling of Greek Proper Names, 57 — His Partiality for Athens, 59 — On Socrates and his Judges, 61 — On Alexander and Aristotle, 65 — On Plato, 71.
 Grotius, Hugo, 5 — Imprisonment of, 25.

H.

Harg, C. J. Mc, his Life of Talleyrand, noticed, 128.
 Heathen Religions, Article on the Comparative Theology of, 183 — 199 — Christian opinions of Heathenism, 185 — Defence of Heathenism, 187 — New School of Writers on, 189 — Ethnic and Catholic Religions, 191 — Study of, 193 — Comparative Theology, 195.
 Hitchcock, Professor, on Religion and Science, reviewed, with extracts, 445 — 460.
 Hoar, Hon. Samuel, Obituary of, 154.
 Hodge, Rev. Dr., on Heresies, 343.
 Homeward Path, The, noticed, 138.
 Horne, T. H., New Edition of his Introduction to the Scriptures, noticed, 302.
 Howland, John, his Life by Stone, reviewed, with extracts, 200 — 210 — Newport and Dr. Hopkins, 201 — Mr. Howland as a Soldier, 203 — Reminiscences, 205 — His Public Services, 207 — On Unitarianism, 209.

I.

Indian Tribes of New England, two Articles on the, 27 — 54, 210 — 237. See *Penobscots*.
 Inspiration, New Views of, 347.
 Intelligence, Literary, 150, 318, 476.
 Italian Journey, An, noticed, 473.
 Italian Pulpit and Preaching, Article on, 92 — 210 — Qualities of Preach-

ers, 95 — Themes of Preaching, 97. — Political Preaching, 99 — Scenic and Dramatic Preaching, 101 — Method of Sermons, 103 — Conservative Preaching, 105 — On the Virgin, 107 — Servility to the Pope, 109.

J.

Jefferson, President, Webster's Visit to, 387.
 Jehovah, Meaning of the Name, 297 — 300.
 Jerusalem, Dr. Robinson on, 171 — Topography of, 173.

K.

Kane, Dr. E. K., his Arctic Expeditions reviewed, 238 — 262 — Search for Sir J. Franklin, 241 — Winter Experiences, 245 — his Explorations and Experiments, 246 — 260. — Merits of his Narrative, 261.
 Kent, Chancellor, Letter to Daniel Webster, 392.
 Kingsley, Charles, his Two Years Ago, noticed, 473.

L.

Lamson, Rev. Dr. Alvan, Sermons by, noticed, 147.
 Lebanon, Dr. Robinson's Description of, 181.
 Logic and Faith, 449.

M.

Maurice, Prince of Nassau, 3 — his Tyranny, 13.
 Mesmerism, 453.
 Milburne, Rev. W. H., his Rifle, Axe, and Saddle-Bags, noticed, 127.

N.

New-England Ministry, The, 121.
 Newport and Dr. Hopkins, 201.
 Nicholson, Rev. J. J., his Blemmertons, noticed, 469.
 Noah, the Flood of, 459.
 Norton, John M., his Rockford Parish, noticed, 471.

O.

Obituary : Hon. Samuel Hoar, 154 — Hon. Sidney Willard, 319.
 Olcott, Harriet A., her Torchlight, noticed, 142.

Olmstead, F. L., his Journey through Texas, noticed, 465.

Oxford Divines, Replies of, to Mr. Jowett, noticed, 308.

P.

Palestine, Books on, 163. Dr. Robinson on, 179.

Park, Professor, his Theology, 355. Parker, Hiram, M. D., his Harmony of Ages, 129.

Peabody, Rev. Dr. E., Tribute to, 262-294 — Remembrances of him, 263 — his Early Home, 265 — At School, 267 — At College, 268 — Theological Studies, 269 — Labors and Illness, 271 — Characteristic Traits, 273 — Ministry at King's Chapel, 275 — Last Illness, 277. — Wishes, 281 — Influence, 283 — Love of the Ministry, 285 — Style of Preaching, 287 — Benevolent Interest, 289 — Conversation, 291 — Humility, 293.

Penobscot Tribe of Indians, Two Articles on, 27-54, 210-237 — Population of, 29 — Sachems of, 31-36 — Religion of, 37 — Roman Catholic Missions to, 39 — Accusations against them, 41 — Wars against the Penobscots, 43-54 — Special Causes of, 211-216 — Treatment by Whites, 219 — In the War of the Revolution, 221 — Territory of, 225 — Town of, 229 — Habits of, 231 — Maidens, 233 — Civilization, 235 — A Friend's Counsel, 237.

Philippians ii. 5-8, Excursus on, 402-433 — Doctrine of, 403.

Philosophy and Theology, 331, 455.

Phrenology, 453.

Plato and Aristotle, 71 — Plato's Trinity, 199.

Preaching, Italian, Article on, 92-110.

Prescott, W. H., his edition of Robertson's Charles V., noticed, 124.

Pulpit, Italian, Article on, 92-110.

Pulpit, American, Dr. Sprague's Annals of, 110-123.

Q.

Quevedo, Sonnet on Rome, 444.

R.

Reflections, 395-402.

Religions, Heathen, Article on, 183-199.

Remusat, M., on Unitarianism, 433-444 — Generosity of Estimate, 435. — On the Influence of Coleridge and Arnold, 441.

Richards, Maria T., her Life in Israel, noticed, 468.

Robinson, Mrs. Sara T. L., her Kansas, noticed, 146.

Robinson, Dr. Edward, his Later Biblical Researches, reviewed, 161-182 — his Earlier Researches, 165 — On the Syrian Mission, 167 — On the City of Akka, 169 — Jerusalem, 171 — On Disputed Localities, 175 — The Jordan and the Perea, 177 — Palestine, 179 — Lebanon, 181.

Rome, Sonnet on, by Quevedo, 444.

Russia, the late Emperor of, 77 — Effect on, of the late War, 85.

S.

Sanctis, Dr. L. De, his Rome, Christian and Papal, noticed, 137.

Science, Wonders of, 457.

Sears, Edmund H., his Pictures of the Olden Time, noticed, 149.

Sprague, Rev. Dr. W. B., his Annals of the American Pulpit, reviewed, 110-123 — His Plan and Spirit commended, 111 — Collection of Letters, 113 — The Congregational Ministry, 115 — Ministers and Physicians, 117.

Step by Step; or, Delia Arlington, noticed, 143.

Stone, Rev. E. M., his Life of Howland, reviewed, 200-210.

Strickland, W. P., Editor of Cartwright's Autobiography, 312.

Syria, Results of American Mission in, 167.

T.

Taylor, John L., his Memoirs of Phillips Family, 145.

Theology, Comparative, the Study of, 195.

Theology, The New, Article on, 321-369 — Historical Development, 323 — Liberalism in Scotch Orthodoxy, 325 — Heresy, 327 — The Science of Theology, 329 — Philosophy of Religion, 331. — Primitive Truth revived, 333 — Metaphysical Theology, 335 — Unitarianism, 337 — Clerical Scepticism, 339 — New School Divinity, 341.

— Dr. Hodge on Heresies, 343 — New Views of the Bible, 345 — Of Inspiration, 347 — Ideas, Forms, and Terms of Theology, 349 — Metaphysics of Divinity, 351 — Assaults on the Old Divinity, 353 — 359 — The Odium Theologicum, 361 — Opponents and Friends of Truth, 365 — Progress of Truth, 367 — Results and Fruits of the New Theology, 369.
 Thermometers in Extreme Cold, 259.
 Tregelles, Dr. S. P., Edition of Horne's Introduction to the Scriptures, 302.
 Tuckerman, H. T., his Biographical Essays, 316.
 Turkey, Effects of the late War on, 81.

U.

Unitarianism, Mr. Howland on, 209 — Limitations of, 337 — M. Remusat on, 433 — 444 — Sketch of English, 437.

V.

Valliet, M., his Geography of Nature, noticed, 142.
 Virgin, Worship of the, 107.

W.

Wales, The Bardic Lore of, 89.
 War in the East, Results of the late,

Article on, 73 — 87 — True Causes of, 75 — Effects on Turkey, 81 — Its Gain to Russia, 85 — Policy of England, 83.

Wars with Penobscot Indians, 43 — 211.

Waverley Novels, New Edition of, 476.

Webster, Daniel, Private Correspondence of, reviewed, with extracts, 370 — 395 — Contents of, 371 — Reminiscences, 373 — Poetry, 375 — Letters to Mr. Fillmore, 377 — to Mr. Dickinson, 379 — to Governor Gore, 381 — Estimate of Byron, 383 — On the Cultivation of Cotton, 385 — Visit to Mr. Jefferson, 387 — Reference to his own Speeches, 389 — Letter on a Farmer's Life, 391 — Letter to Chancellor Kent, 392.

Whorter, Alex. Mac, on The Memorial Name, reviewed, 295 — 302 — Meaning of the Name Jehovah, 297 — Not the Messiah, 301.

Willis, N. P., his Paul Fane, noticed, 144.

Willard, Hon. Sidney, Obituary of, 319.

Wood, George, his Marrying too Late, noticed, 133.

Y.

Yoakum, H., his History of Texas, noticed, 147.

SPECIAL NOTICE.

By purchase of Crosby, Nichols, & Co., dating from January 1st, 1857, the CHRISTIAN EXAMINER has passed into the hands of a new proprietor. The Rev. FREDERIC H. HEDGE, D.D., of Brookline, Mass., and the Rev. EDWARD EVERETT HALE, of Boston, have assumed the editorial charge of the work; and attention is solicited to their annexed Prospectus.

Every effort will be made by the Editors and the Proprietor to sustain the high character this journal has so long borne, and to make such improvements as may promise to increase its value and extend its circulation.

The office of the CHRISTIAN EXAMINER is removed to the Rooms of the

AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION,

No. 21 Bromfield Street;

but subscriptions will also be received, and payments may be made, at the bookstore of

CROSBY, NICHOLS, & Co.,

111 Washington Street.

In consequence of the change of proprietorship, early attention to the subscriptions now due will be esteemed a favor.

BOSTON, May 1st, 1857.

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

Prospectus of a New Series.

THE number for July of the CHRISTIAN EXAMINER—the first of Vol. LXIII.—will initiate a new series of this Journal, now one of the oldest in the periodical literature of America.

In assuming its editorial supervision, the subscribers announce to its patrons and friends, that the Fifth Series of the Examiner will adopt in general the aim of its predecessors, and will carry on the project of a journal instituted in a liberal and progressive spirit, as an organ of theological discussion, and of literary and philosophic criticism.

In this interest they solicit the continued aid of former contributors.

The new series will abate nothing of the liberality which has characterized the work in times past, which befits the interests represented in it, and which the late conscientious and efficient editor has so scrupulously maintained. But while the Examiner proposes to itself the uttermost freedom consistent with its name and mission, it will be understood that this freedom has its limits, and that no journal which bears in any sense a representative character is free to affront the convictions of the great majority of its constituents. Yet will no communication be rejected for opinion's sake, of which the aim and spirit are not manifestly subversive of Church and State, or in conflict with all our antecedents.

Contributions will be published anonymously, unless some extraordinary and exceptional case shall seem to require the author's name.

The editors propose to devote in this series a larger space than has heretofore been given to a critical survey of contemporary literature, including periodicals (a new feature), and to literary and scientific intelligence. Competent assistants at home and abroad are engaged to co-operate in this department.

With these premises, the Examiner is commended anew to the favor and support of the friends of truth, of progress, and of letters.

DERIC H. HEDGE.
EDWARD EVERETT HALE.

BOSTON, May 1st, 1857.

Comp

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

N^o. CXCIX.

FOURTH SERIES.—No. LXXIX.

JANUARY, 1857.

BOSTON:
CROSBY, NICHOLS, AND COMPANY.

NEW YORK: C. S. FRANCIS & CO., 554 BROADWAY.

LONDON: EDWARD T. WHITFIELD, 178 STRAND.

1857.

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER

AND

RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

REV. GEORGE E. ELLIS, of Charlestown, - - - - - *Editor.*

CROSBY, NICHOLS, & CO.,
BOOKSELLERS AND PUBLISHERS,
GENERAL AGENTS
FOR ALL PERIODICALS, AMERICAN AND FOREIGN,
111 Washington Street,
BOSTON.

C., N., & CO. ARE PUBLISHERS OF
THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW,
QUARTERLY, AT FIVE DOLLARS A YEAR.

THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER,
BI-MONTHLY, AT FOUR DOLLARS A YEAR.

THE LAW REPORTER,
MONTHLY, AT THREE DOLLARS A YEAR.

CROSBY, NICHOLS, & CO.
Import FOREIGN Books to order by every Steamer.

Persons leaving their names with us can be furnished with the late
LONDON CATALOGUES AS ISSUED.

CROSBY, NICHOLS, & CO.,
111 WASHINGTON STREET,
BOSTON.

CROSBY, NICHOLS, & CO.'S
GENERAL PERIODICAL AGENCY,
American and Foreign.

REVIEWS.

London,	} \$ 8.00 for the four, and Edinburgh,	with Blackwood's North British, } Mag. included, \$ 10, Westminster,	or \$ 3.00 each.
Brownson's Quarterly			\$ 3.00
North American			5.00
Christian Examiner			4.00
Monthly Religious Magazine			3.00
National Preacher			1.00
New Englander			3.00
Christian Review			3.00
Universalist Quarterly			2.00
Bibliotheca Sacra			4.00
Biblical Repertory			3.00
Methodist Quarterly			2.00
Church Review			3.00
Theological and Literary Journal			3.00
New Jerusalem Magazine			2.00

RELIGIOUS.	
Christian Examiner	4.00
Monthly Religious Magazine	3.00
National Preacher	1.00
New Englander	3.00
Christian Review	3.00
Universalist Quarterly	2.00
Bibliotheca Sacra	4.00
Biblical Repertory	3.00
Methodist Quarterly	2.00
Church Review	3.00
Theological and Literary Journal	3.00
New Jerusalem Magazine	2.00

LITERARY.	
Blackwood's Magazine	3.00
Eclectic Magazine	5.00
Living Age (weekly)	6.00
Knickerbocker	3.00
Harper's Magazine	3.00
Putnam's Magazine	3.00
Southern Literary Messenger	3.00
Ballou's Dollar Magazine	1.00
Household Words	3.00

MEDICAL.	
Braithwaite's Retrospect of Medical Science	2.00
Medico-Chirurgical Review	3.00
London Lancet	5.00
Ranking's Abstract	1.50
Boston Medical & Surgical Journal	3.00
New York Journal of Medicine	3.00
American Journal of Medical Science	5.00

Southern Journal of Medicine	\$ 4.00
American Journal of Dental Science	5.00

LAW.

Law Library	10.00
Law Reporter	3.00
Library of Law and Equity	7.00

**MERCANTILE, SCIENTIFIC,
AND STATISTICAL.**

Hunt's Merchants' Magazine	5.00
Bankers' Magazine and Statistical Register	5.00
Silliman's Journal of Science and Arts	5.00
Journal of the Franklin Institute	5.00
New England Historical and Genealogical Register	2.00

JUVENILE.

Merry's Museum	1.00
Parley's Magazine	1.00
Youth's Cabinet	1.00
Child's Friend	1.50

PICTORIAL MONTHLIES.

London Art Journal	9.00
" Punch	6.00
" Illustrated News	12.00
Graham's Magazine	3.00
Godey's Lady's Book	3.00
Ladies' National Magazine	2.00
Christian Parlor Magazine	2.00
Ladies' Garland	1.00
Family Circle	1.00

MISCELLANEOUS.

Mother's Magazine	1.00
Mother's Assistant	1.00
Massachusetts Teacher	1.00
Plough, Loom, and Anvil	3.00
Cultivator	1.00
Agriculturalist	1.00
Magazine of Horticulture	2.00
Fowler's Phrenological Journal	1.00

** Clubs, societies, and individuals, who take several works, supplied at a discount from regular prices.

If Orders from any part of the country, accompanied with the money, will receive prompt attention.

CROSBY, NICHOLS, & CO.,
 111 Washington Street, Boston.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

A G E N T S .

ALBANY, - - -	W. C. Little & Co.	LOWELL, - - -	Oliver March.
BALTIMORE, - - -	Herman A. Smith.	NEW BEDFORD,	William Howe.
BANGOR, - - -	Charles Hight & Co.	NEW YORK, - - -	C. S. Francis & Co.
BURLINGTON, - - -	Edward Smith.	PHILADELPHIA,	George Collins.
CAMBRIDGE, - - -	John Bartlett.	PLYMOUTH, - - -	Rev. Dr. Kendall.
CHARLESTON, - - -	John Greer.	PORTSMOUTH, - - -	J. H. Foster.
CONCORD, - - -	A. Stacy.	PROVIDENCE, - - -	G. H. Whitney.
EXETER, - - -	F. Grant.	SALEM, - - -	C. Foote.
KEENE, - - -	G. & G. H. Tilden.	WORCESTER, - - -	S. Thompson & Co.

 THE EXAMINER is published on the first of JANUARY, MARCH, MAY, JULY, SEPTEMBER, and NOVEMBER, in numbers of 156 octavo pages each, at *four dollars* a year, payable on the publication of the second number, that is, on the 1st of March.

The work will be sent *by mail* to any part of the United States, free of postage, on the remittance of a year's subscription to the publishers, Boston.

* * Those who order from Agents or Booksellers must look to them for their numbers.

On deposit by

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

N^o. CC.
FOURTH SERIES.—No. LXXX.
MARCH, 1857.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY THE PROPRIETOR,
AT THE ROOMS OF THE AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION,
21 BROMFIELD STREET.

CROSBY, NICHOLS, AND COMPANY,
111 WASHINGTON STREET.

NEW YORK: C. S. FRANCIS & CO., 554 BROADWAY.

LONDON: EDWARD T. WHITFIELD, 178 STRAND.

1857.

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER

AND

RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

REV. GEORGE E. ELLIS, of Charlestown, - - - - - *Editor.*

CROSBY, NICHOLS, & CO.,
BOOKSELLERS AND PUBLISHERS,
GENERAL AGENTS
FOR ALL PERIODICALS, AMERICAN AND FOREIGN,
111 Washington Street,
BOSTON.

C., N., & CO. ARE PUBLISHERS OF
THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW,
QUARTERLY, AT FIVE DOLLARS A YEAR.

THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER,
BI-MONTHLY, AT FOUR DOLLARS A YEAR.

THE LAW REPORTER,
MONTHLY, AT THREE DOLLARS A YEAR.

CROSBY, NICHOLS, & CO.
Import FOREIGN Books to order by every Steamer.

Persons leaving their names with us can be furnished with the late
LONDON CATALOGUES AS ISSUED.

CROSBY, NICHOLS, & CO.,
111 WASHINGTON STREET,
BOSTON.

CROSBY, NICHOLS, & CO.'S
GENERAL PERIODICAL AGENCY,
American and Foreign.

REVIEWS.

London,	} \$ 8.00 for the four, and Edinburgh,	with Blackwood's North British, Mag. included, \$ 10, Westminster, or \$ 3.00 each.
Brownson's Quarterly		\$ 3.00
North American		5.00
Christian Examiner		4.00
Monthly Religious Magazine		3.00
National Preacher		1.00
New Englander		3.00
Christian Review		3.00
Universalist Quarterly		2.00
Bibliotheca Sacra		4.00
Biblical Repertory		3.00
Methodist Quarterly		2.00
Church Review		3.00
Theological and Literary Journal		3.00
New Jerusalem Magazine		2.00

RELIGIOUS.

Christian Examiner	4.00
Monthly Religious Magazine	3.00
National Preacher	1.00
New Englander	3.00
Christian Review	3.00
Universalist Quarterly	2.00
Bibliotheca Sacra	4.00
Biblical Repertory	3.00
Methodist Quarterly	2.00
Church Review	3.00
Theological and Literary Journal	3.00
New Jerusalem Magazine	2.00

LITERARY.

Blackwood's Magazine	3.00
Eclectic Magazine	5.00
Living Age (weekly)	6.00
Knickerbocker	3.00
Harper's Magazine	3.00
Putnam's Magazine	3.00
Southern Literary Messenger	3.00
Ballou's Dollar Magazine	1.00
Household Words	3.00

MEDICAL.

Braithwaite's Retrospect of Medical Science	2.00
Medico-Chirurgical Review	3.00
London Lancet	5.00
Ranking's Abstract	1.50
Boston Medical & Surgical Journal	3.00
New York Journal of Medicine	3.00
American Journal of Medical Science	5.00

Southern Journal of Medicine	\$ 4.00
American Journal of Dental Science	5.00

LAW.

Law Library	10.00
Law Reporter	3.00
Library of Law and Equity	7.00

**MERCANTILE, SCIENTIFIC,
AND STATISTICAL.**

Hunt's Merchants' Magazine	5.00
Bankers' Magazine and Statistical Register	5.00
Silliman's Journal of Science and Arts	5.00
Journal of the Franklin Institute	5.00
New England Historical and Genealogical Register	2.00

JUVENILE.

Merry's Museum	1.00
Parley's Magazine	1.00
Youth's Cabinet	1.00
Child's Friend	1.50

PICTORIAL MONTHLIES.

London Art Journal	9.00
" Punch	6.00
" Illustrated News	12.00
Graham's Magazine	3.00
Godey's Lady's Book	3.00
Ladies' National Magazine	2.00
Christian Parlor Magazine	2.00
Ladies' Garland	1.00
Family Circle	1.00

MISCELLANEOUS.

Mother's Magazine	1.00
Mother's Assistant	1.00
Massachusetts Teacher	1.00
Plough, Loom, and Anvil	3.00
Cultivator	1.00
Agriculturalist	1.00
Magazine of Horticulture	2.00
Fowler's Phrenological Journal	1.00

** Clubs, societies, and individuals, who take several works, supplied at a discount from regular prices.

[P] Orders from any part of the country, accompanied with the money, will receive prompt attention.

CROSBY, NICHOLS, & CO.,

111 Washington Street, Boston.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

A G E N T S .

ALBANY, - - -	W. C. Little & Co.	LOWELL, - - -	Oliver March.
BALTIMORE, - - -	Herman A. Smith.	NEW BEDFORD,	William Howe.
BANGOR, - - -	Charles Hight & Co.	NEW YORK,	C. S. Francis & Co.
BURLINGTON, - - -	Edward Smith.	PHILADELPHIA,	George Collins.
CAMBRIDGE, - - -	John Bartlett.	PLYMOUTH,	Rev. Dr. Kendall.
CHARLESTON, - - -	John Greer.	PORTSMOUTH,	J. H. Foster.
CONCORD, - - -	A. Stacy.	PROVIDENCE,	G. H. Whitney.
EXETER, - - -	F. Grant.	SALEM,	C. Foote.
KEENE, - - -	G. & G. H. Tilden.	WORCESTER,	S. Thompson & Co.

 THE EXAMINER is published on the first of JANUARY, MARCH, MAY, JULY, SEPTEMBER, and NOVEMBER, in numbers of 156 octavo pages each, at *four dollars* a year, payable on the publication of the second number, that is, on the 1st of March.

The work will be sent *by mail* to any part of the United States, free of postage, on the remittance of a year's subscription to the publishers, Boston.

* * * Those who order from Agents or Booksellers must look to them for their numbers.

C. Stetson Esq

THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER

AND

RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

NO. CCI.

FOURTH SERIES.—No. LXXXI.

MAY, 1857.

BOSTON:

PUBLISHED BY THE PROPRIETOR,

AT THE ROOMS OF THE AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION,
21 BROMFIELD STREET.

CROSBY, NICHOLS, AND COMPANY,
111 WASHINGTON STREET.

NEW YORK: C. S. FRANCIS & CO., 554 BROADWAY.

LONDON: EDWARD T. WHITFIELD, 178 STRAND.

1857.

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER

AND

RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

REV. GEORGE E. ELLIS, of Charlestown, - - - - - *Editor.*

CROSBY, NICHOLS, & CO.,
BOOKSELLERS AND PUBLISHERS,
GENERAL AGENTS
FOR ALL PERIODICALS, AMERICAN AND FOREIGN,
111 Washington Street,
BOSTON.

C., N., & CO. ARE PUBLISHERS OF
THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW,
QUARTERLY, AT FIVE DOLLARS A YEAR.

THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER,
BI-MONTHLY, AT FOUR DOLLARS A YEAR.

THE LAW REPORTER,
MONTHLY, AT THREE DOLLARS A YEAR.

CROSBY, NICHOLS, & CO.
Import FOREIGN Books to order by every Steamer.

Persons leaving their names with us can be furnished with the late
LONDON CATALOGUES AS ISSUED.

CROSBY, NICHOLS, & CO.,
111 WASHINGTON STREET,
BOSTON.

CROSBY, NICHOLS, & CO.'S
GENERAL PERIODICAL AGENCY,
American and Foreign.

REVIEWS.

London,	} \$ 8.00 for the four, and Edinburgh,	with Blackwood's North British,	Mag. included, \$ 10, Westminster,	or \$ 3.00 each.	\$ 3.00
Brownson's Quarterly					
North American					

RELIGIOUS.

Christian Examiner	4.00
Monthly Religious Magazine	3.00
National Preacher	1.00
New Englander	3.00
Christian Review	3.00
Universalist Quarterly	2.00
Bibliotheca Sacra	4.00
Biblical Repertory	3.00
Methodist Quarterly	2.00
Church Review	3.00
Theological and Literary Journal	3.00
New Jerusalem Magazine	2.00

LITERARY.

Blackwood's Magazine	3.00
Eclectic Magazine	5.00
Living Age (weekly)	6.00
Knickerbocker	3.00
Harper's Magazine	3.00
Putnam's Magazine	3.00
Southern Literary Messenger	3.00
Ballou's Dollar Magazine	1.00
Household Words	3.00

MEDICAL.

Braithwaite's Retrospect of Medical Science	2.00
Medico-Chirurgical Review	3.00
London Lancet	5.00
Ranking's Abstract	1.50
Boston Medical & Surgical Journal	3.00
New York Journal of Medicine	3.00
American Journal of Medical Science	5.00

Southern Journal of Medicine	\$ 4.00
American Journal of Dental Science	5.00

LAW.

Law Library	10.00
Law Reporter	3.00
Library of Law and Equity	7.00

**MERCANTILE, SCIENTIFIC,
AND STATISTICAL.**

Hunt's Merchants' Magazine	5.00
Bankers' Magazine and Statistical Register	5.00
Silliman's Journal of Science and Arts	5.00
Journal of the Franklin Institute	5.00
New England Historical and Genealogical Register	2.00

JUVENILE.

Merry's Museum	1.00
Parley's Magazine	1.00
Youth's Cabinet	1.00
Child's Friend	1.50

PICTORIAL MONTHLIES.

London Art Journal	9.00
" Punch	6.00
" Illustrated News	12.00
Graham's Magazine	3.00
Godey's Lady's Book	3.00
Ladies' National Magazine	2.00
Christian Parlor Magazine	2.00
Ladies' Garland	1.00
Family Circle	1.00

MISCELLANEOUS.

Mother's Magazine	1.00
Mother's Assistant	1.00
Massachusetts Teacher	1.00
Plough, Loom, and Anvil	3.00
Cultivator	1.00
Agriculturalist	1.00
Magazine of Horticulture	2.00
Fowler's Phrenological Journal	1.00

** Clubs, societies, and individuals, who take several works, supplied at a discount from regular prices.

Orders from any part of the country, accompanied with the money, will receive prompt attention.

CROSBY, NICHOLS, & CO.,

111 Washington Street, Boston.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

A G E N T S .

ALBANY, - - -	W. C. Little & Co.	LOWELL, - - -	Oliver March.
BALTIMORE, - - -	Herman A. Smith.	NEW BEDFORD,	William Howe.
BANGOR, - - -	Charles Hight & Co.	NEW YORK, - - -	C. S. Francis & Co.
BURLINGTON, - - -	Edward Smith.	PHILADELPHIA,	George Collins.
CAMBRIDGE, - - -	John Bartlett.	PLYMOUTH, - - -	Rev. Dr. Kendall.
CHARLESTON, - - -	John Greer.	PORTSMOUTH, - - -	J. H. Foster.
CONCORD, - - -	A. Stacy.	PROVIDENCE, - - -	G. H. Whitney.
EXETER, - - -	F. Grant.	SALEM, - - -	C. Foote.
KEENE, - - -	G. & G. H. Tilden.	WORCESTER, - - -	S. Thompson & Co.

 THE EXAMINER is published on the first of JANUARY, MARCH, MAY, JULY, SEPTEMBER, and NOVEMBER, in numbers of 156 octavo pages each, at *four dollars* a year, payable on the publication of the second number, that is, on the 1st of March.

The work will be sent *by mail* to any part of the United States, free of postage, on the remittance of a year's subscription to the publishers, Boston.

* * Those who order from Agents or Booksellers must look to them for their numbers.

